

FIFTY CENTS

CATHOLIC MIND

September-October, 1959

Protestant-Catholic Dialog

The Liturgy in Focus

Failure of the West

Function of the Catholic Press

ARTICLES • PAPAL AND EPISCOPAL STATEMENTS • ADDRESSES

Thu

E
Vinc

With
th

E
328
Ne

Bu
Clay

Circ
Patr

B
70
New

C
T
Fore

SE
VOI

CATHOLIC MIND

57th Year • An America Press Publication

EDITOR

Thurston N. Davis, S.J.

•

EXECUTIVE EDITOR

Vincent S. Kearney, S.J.

•

With the collaboration of
the AMERICA staff

•

EDITORIAL OFFICE

329 West 108 Street,
New York 25, N. Y.

•

BUSINESS MANAGER

Clayton F. Nenno, S.J.

•

CIRCULATION MANAGER

Patrick H. Collins, S.J.

•

BUSINESS OFFICE

70 East 45 Street,
New York 17, N. Y.

•

One Year—\$3.00

Two Years—\$5.00

Foreign—\$3.50 Yearly

SEPT.-OCT., 1959

VOL. LVII, No. 1145

ARTICLES AND ADDRESSES

Protestant-Catholic
Dialog 388 *Christianity & Crisis*

A Re-examination
of the
Liturgical Movement 404 *Spiritual Life*

East, West
and the Cold War 414 Charles Malik

The Function of
the Catholic Press 421 Msgr. F. J. Lally

The Morality
of Hypnosis 427 *Linacre Quarterly*

Vatican Manuscript
Library in America 439 *Priest*

The Kerala Story 445 *Expulsus*

Faith and the
Human Personality 450 B. J. Cooke, S.J.

DOCUMENTATION

To the Clergy
of Venice 459 John XXIII

Purpose of the
Catholic Press 466 John XXIII

Integration and
Christian Conscience 469 Most Rev. A. G. Meyer

The Right
to Migrate 478 Australian Hierarchy

Books by these Authors
were selections of the

Catholic Book Club

during the past year

Members save an average of 31%

Thomas Merton
Jean Danielou
Ronald Knox
Henri Daniel-Rops
Sister M. Madeleva
Helen C. White
Tudor Edwards
John Considine
Harold Gardiner
Michael de la Bedoyere
E.E.Y. Hales
John LaFarge
H.F.M. Prescott
Charles Ferguson

The oldest book club of its kind in the country offers you the finest in current Catholic literature at savings as high as 51%. You pay only \$2.98 for Catholic Book Club selections. There is no minimum number of books which you are required to take. You may cancel your membership at any time.

The CBC is a service of the Jesuit Fathers of America Press. It is designed for Catholics who like fine books, or who want to like them. CBC offers you the opportunity to build an excellent library at a minimum cost.

Write today for your free Newsletter which reviews the current selection. New members receive *two* CBC books for only \$2.98.

CATHOLIC BOOK CLUB

70 East 45th Street, New York 17, N.Y.

IN THIS ISSUE

- Three Catholic authors, GUSTAVE WEIGEL, S.J., professor of ecclesiology at Woodstock College, sociologist THOMAS F. O'DEA, and WILLIAM CLANCY, editor of *Worldview*, discuss the need for Protestant-Catholic dialog and the terms on which dialog would be profitable to both faiths.
- FATHER WILLIAM, O.C.D., editor of *Spiritual Life*, takes to task the liturgical movement as it has developed in the United States. Though "one of the most significant spiritual forces of our age," the movement, he fears, is in danger of stagnation because of an unbalanced emphasis on collective worship. Too little attention is paid to the individual's need for contemplation.
- CHARLES MALIK, Lebanese statesman and president of the UN General Assembly, indicts the West for its inability to understand what is really at stake in today's divided world—the spiritual values which have made Western civilization great.
- MGR. FRANCIS J. LALLY, editor of Boston's archdiocesan newspaper, the *Pilot*, defines the work of the Catholic press. Our task, he writes, is to be "involved" in the concrete world of today, "not to be moralizing on theoretical and ideal cases in which no one is either interested or committed."
- JOSEPH T. MANGAN, S.J., a professor of moral theology, explores the morality of hypnosis with particular emphasis on its use in medical therapy.
- On April 5, 1957 a Communist government gained control of India's Kerala State. It was the first time in the history of communism that the Reds obtained their objective by constitutional means. T. VADASSERY, of Poona's De Nobili College, tells how the Communists won the election that put them in power and describes the reign of terror that ensued for the people of Kerala.

THE CATHOLIC MIND, September-October, 1959. Volume LVII, No. 1145. Published bi-monthly by The America Press, Grand Central Terminal Building, 70 E. 45 St., New York 17, N.Y. Subscription postpaid: yearly \$3.50; Canada and foreign \$3.50; single copy 50 cents. Second Class Postage paid at New York, N.Y.

Three Catholic writers speak frankly about how Protestantism appears to them, about sources of tension and about their experience, as Catholics, of American institutions.

Protestant-Catholic Dialog*

I

Inside American Roman Catholicism

GUSTAVE WEIGEL, S.J.

AN EDITOR of a Protestant journal of opinion recently stated that one of the current tasks facing a Protestant religious journalist is to tell American Protestants that America is no longer a Protestant country. Whether Protestants have to be informed of this fact may possibly be debated but the fact itself cannot be. Yet no one will draw the illegitimate conclusion that

America is already or is becoming a Roman Catholic land. Percentage-wise, the Roman Catholic Church has not grown much in the last forty years.

But in this land of many religious minorities how are we to interpret the Roman Catholic reality? Sociological studies have been made but the limitations and detachment with which such studies are pro-

*Reprinted from *Christianity and Crisis*, 537 W. 121 St., N.Y. 27, N.Y., June 8, 1959.

duced rarely shed great light on the lived existence of the Roman Catholic collectivity. An investigation must be made from the inside. Yet this is a difficult task. There certainly is something that can be called a collective consciousness of the total group, but to get at it one must rely on an individual consciousness that is hopelessly hemmed in by its own individuality. Nevertheless, it is worthwhile to make an attempt at investigation even under such precarious conditions.

An American Catholic Church

Aristotle wanted definitions to be derived from genus and differentiae. The American Roman Catholic Church is therefore a Roman Catholic church and different from all other Roman Catholic churches because it is American. This may seem to say little, but actually it says much. Differences are not accidentals tacked on to the genus. They suffuse it totally.

There is no call here to describe generic Catholicism. Our effort will be directed to the American differentiae. The American component of American Catholicism obviously entered into it by way of history. Into a land staked off as the claim of Protestant groups, the Catholic intruded. This intrusion came not as a single blow but in a steady flow over 150 years. By and large the Catholic came either as a non-English speaker or as an Irishman. In either case he was culturally alien to the British possessors of the land. Religiously he was suspect.

Whether we like it or not, Protestants and Catholics are inevitably related to each other by the concept of opposition, and the opposition is stronger the nearer we approach the moment of the split of one from the other. Today we are all striving manfully to overcome the sense of opposition, but we are descendants of the past and history works in all of us.

The first Catholics, therefore, walked into a hostile environment. This does not mean that there were barbarous persecutions or gross inhumanity. The persecutions were petty and the individual Catholic could and did avoid them either through personal friendship with individual Protestants or by taking refuge in a ghetto built by himself and his kind.

The immigrating Catholics were also, in general, poor folk escaping from the hardships proper to lower social classes of Europe. They did not bring with them much learning nor even a great awareness of the good of learning. The capital the Catholic brought with him was his will to improve his secular condition and his readiness to work hard in his attempts. Those who did not have this capital returned to their lands of origin or soon died.

As the English know, America, in spite of its English roots, is not England. It is a new thing with subtle power. The American Dream, or whatever we wish to call it, had (and pray God that it still has!) a transforming power that it infused into its own, making them one. The

European Catholics who came to America became American. The result was that the Catholicism they brought with them became American as well.

It was not done without growing pains. Some of the Europeans of the 19th century did not want an American Catholic Church but a confederation of European Catholic churches on American soil. They were led by German spokesmen, but World War I showed the Americans of German stock that they themselves were Americans and not Germans. The whole American Catholic Church suddenly became aware of itself as Catholic and American and has never lost that awareness.

From 1918 onwards, Roman Catholicism in America took on a new vitality because of its own achieved identification. The result was that any clear-eyed observer could see that the American Catholic Church was a power and a force in the land. It was no longer struggling to survive or to be accepted. It had "arrived."

However, the effects of its earlier history showed up clearly. There was a sudden pride of achievement that was more adolescent than mature. Catholicism became cocky and would tolerate no criticism from within or without. Where it could, it "threw its weight around." The older fear and resentment toward Protestants now turned into smug, but edgy, aloofness. One could almost hear the American Catholics say: "You have had your day; now we have ours."

The pain and distress involved in the Al Smith campaign of 1928 was a salutary and chastening experience. Even if America was not religiously Protestant, it was by no means pro-Catholic. In consequence, a more objective self-examination slowly spread over the group. Catholics began to criticize themselves and did so with a candor that should have amazed non-Catholics—but American Protestantism did not even notice.

The basic weakness inherent in the Catholic community was its lack of scholarship. It had loyalty, organization and numerical strength but it had too little intellectualism, in spite of its growing educational system built laboriously by the Catholics without outside aid. This weakness could not become conscious until a sufficient number of American Catholic intellectuals were formed; and they were being formed in the '30s and '40s. The result is that voices have been since heard and embarrassment felt. However, these things are themselves the first steps of coming improvement.

At the present moment, the American Catholic Church is neither a harassed minority nor a beligerent group. It is more prone to conservatism than radical change. Its tendency is toward American chauvinism rather than anything anti-American. It is rather contemptuous of what is foreign, even when visible in the Catholic Church elsewhere. Its generosity, activism and optimism are probably more American than Catholic.

Ignorance of Protestantism

One thing American Protestants must recognize, though they are slow to do so, is that American Catholics are no threat to them, nor do they wish to be. The diminution of Protestant power understandably makes Protestants nervous, but there is no ground for their nervousness.

The American Catholics do not consider Protestantism as their great preoccupation nor do they pay much attention to it. They arrange their own affairs and conversations with little or no concern for the Protestant dimension of our country. At times they are faced with certain movements that have a nuisance value, as for example the Protestants and Other Americans United for Separation of Church and State, that Catholics fortunately do not identify with the Protestant community. (In fact, it must be embarrassing for many Protestants to see this group use in its proper name a label that is so much bigger than it and that means something better than the POAU movement.) However, in general the American Catholics do not define themselves or their activities in terms of Protestant reference.

This attitude, besides the advantage of eliminating maintained hostility for Protestantism, also has a palpable disadvantage. Although American Catholics have many friends and relatives who are Protestants, yet they know so little about Protestantism and show no great desire to know more. It would

almost be true to say that the American Catholics, in constant amicable relationships with Protestants, ignore Protestantism. They are not curious to find out the doctrines of Protestantism, nor its ways of worship and structure. It is not clear in their minds what distinguishes an Episcopalian from a Methodist. Luther vaguely means something, but Lutherans are supposed to be undifferentiated Protestants with a German background. The multitude of the more angular smaller denominations simply confuses the Catholic without stimulating him to clarify his confusion.

In such a situation the American Catholic is totally unprepared for ecumenical dialog, though this is the task that our moment calls for. There is no Catholic hostility to ecumenism. There is just a great ignorance of what it is and why it is important.

Some few voices have been raised in American Catholic circles pointing sympathetically to the ecumenical movement, and they have been heard. But they have not made a deep or wide impact. Perhaps the few Catholic ecumenists will manage to arouse great interest in their work, and there are signs that the young Catholics, clerical and lay, are waking up to its importance. However, as of the moment not much is being accomplished. The American Catholic makes his own the principle lately enunciated by Professor Oscar Cullmann—that Catholicism and Protestantism are irreconcilable. But unlike Cullmann,

the American Catholic does not see that much must yet be done in Christian charity.

The electoral campaign of 1960 is already aborning. The presence of Senator John Kennedy among the possible candidates will produce intransquillity. In God's goodness it may be the occasion for Catholic

ecumenical action. Perhaps it may even do the contrary.

Certainly the ecumenical council to be summoned by Pope John XXIII should produce some good fruits, at least in the world-wide preparations for the council sessions. Just now, with these possibilities before us, we must wait, hope and see.

II

The Ideologists and the Missing Dialog

THOMAS F. O'DEA

OSCAR CULLMANN stated recently that the prerequisite for Protestant-Roman Catholic conversation is "complete openness." Actually this aim, achievable among some groups in Europe, is too high for American conditions. The best we can do is to work for a growing openness as we build some basis in mutual trust and friendship. Our bridges are very weak. They bear a warning—"Capacity: not too many tons"—and we are all quite good at implicitly reading such signs.

Thus, Protestant-Catholic dialog in this country does not take place in an atmosphere of relaxation and interior freedom. It is usually characterized by a kind of distant and respectful restraint expressing a kind of etiolated good will. Only

real and fairly continuous association can bring relaxation of such attitudes. While individuals achieve this, representative individuals in religious or semi-religious dialog usually fall far short of it. And the two great religious bodies certainly do not attain anything like this.

One result of this general absence of Christian dialog is that one receives the impression—rather a caricature of the facts—that the reciprocal attitudes of the two groups are quite antagonistic. This impression arises from the statements and actions of the noisier elements on each side, who may be characterized in terms of two identifiable groups.

Let us call them, for want of better terms, Catholic hyper-integralists and Protestant hyper-reformation-

ists. Both find a marked satisfaction in carrying out, quite inappropriately in the contemporary setting, religious conflicts of the past. The source of this satisfaction deserves deep study. All that can be done here is to suggest some elements that must be included in any adequate hypothesis.

The Hyper-Integralists

The Catholic hyper-integralists want two incompatible things at once. They want some kind of Catholic ghetto and, at the same time, they seek to identify Catholicism with America and Americanism, understanding the latter especially in terms of right-wing political opinions. They see no need for any larger expression of Christian solidarity nor any useful end in genuine dialog with Protestants or others about fundamental value-problems. Their viewpoint is an ideology in the sense that it displays a marked economy in relation to the ambiguities of reality. It is a set of stereotypes and is given to blacks and whites, rights and wrongs, fors and againsts.

Ideologies are embraced because they serve some function—often implicit and unrecognized—for their adherents. They fulfill needs and allay anxieties.

Hyper-integralists suffer from two strains, both derived from their historical experience. They experience the defensiveness of all Christianity before the rapid secularization of culture. This is aggravated by the defensive posture that much of

post-Tridentine Catholicism has inherited from the Counter Reformation.

Another closely related set of strains derives from the American Catholic experience. Immigration and assimilation were difficult processes for those involved, and they precipitated attitudes that did not simply fade away when the most palpable difficulties no longer existed. Catholics were not well received at first. This is a fact, one that Protestants perhaps do not ponder enough. Many of them were Irish and brought with them bitter memories of oppression by a Protestant ruling class in Ireland. Thus certain symbols and their attendant feeling tones are often differently experienced by Catholics and Protestants, who in fact may be equally "democratic."

Consequently Catholics as a group have developed a complex relationship to America, and the very complexity lies precisely in areas not easily understood by the ordinary man. The American Catholic feels himself an American, wants to be and is glad he is an American, takes over American middle-class values and joins the social mobility merry-go-round with his Protestant fellows.

To the extent that he remains Catholic, he often finds it difficult to relate himself to some aspects of American culture, especially to intellectual areas of life that derive from a Protestant substrate and show pronounced secularization, and to other areas more closely related to Protestantism proper.

When Catholics become middle class they take over many of the general fears and anxieties of the middle class, fears of aggrandizement of other groups at their expense. Since Catholics derived recently from lower-class status, their new middle-class attitudes may involve some degree of guilt.

Moreover, since Catholic values have stressed social ethics, the new political and social attitudes may involve guilt on this score. The unevenly assimilated Catholic needs something to enable him to handle these problems, something to give him a new conception and legitimization of himself and to supply him with the basic security that is derived in less mobile societies from social solidarity and tradition. This function is served by the ideology of hyper-integralism.

This is done by making a strident identification of Catholicism with America and Americanism, which also exorcizes the heritage of the Enlightenment and its modern leftist derivatives. Not only is Catholicism equated with genuine Americanism, but secularism is rendered unAmerican, and criticism of bourgeois values becomes anti-American and anti-Catholic. America, the business system and the Catholic Church stand together, attacked by a common enemy. Their defense is a single task.

The earlier defensiveness invites a militant response and the bothersome problems—difficult to make explicit and to evaluate rationally—are translated into bogeys to be com-

bated. Thus a lot of anxiety-provoking problems are given some kind of formulation, and therapists tell us that any kind of definition offers a measure of relief. Furthermore, identification of the problems makes an attack upon them possible, albeit only a symbolic one. But the symbolic attack provides the self-definition that is needed and acts as a catharsis for built-up tensions.

Three marks of ideology may be distinguished: stereotyped oversimplification of reality, militancy and rigidity. The last reveals the presence of anxiety, and the presence of aggressiveness is an obvious response to strain. We have here a historically conditioned social and cultural syndrome involving displacement and projection. I do not mean that it is a neurosis in the individual sense, though in some cases it may be. It is an instance of social pathology.

The Hyper-Reformationists

The hyper-reformationists—the Protestant equivalents of the Catholics just described—also are reacting in terms of historical conditioning to contemporary strains. Protestants and Protestantism today are having to accept something less than the central and dominant position they have long had in American culture and society. The social mobility of other groups, among whom the Catholics are prominent, makes this the case.

Once securely identified with the core of American culture and society, Protestants now must move over

a bit. That men do not move over graciously is one of the few undeniable generalizations from history. This adjustment is not yet clearly explicit in Protestant thinking, but the nudge is felt and is responded to.

When upsetting social developments, such as industrialization and urbanization, shook American society in the 19th century, it was fairly standard for many Protestant groups to respond in terms of anti-Catholic clichés. The great and honorable tradition of Protest has had the unfortunate by-product of supplying the man in the street with a ready set of counters from Foxe's *Martyrs* and the "Black Legend" with which to organize experience. Such clichés serve similar purposes today.

Catholics are certainly nervous in the face of the rapid secularization of culture, but Protestants are, often enough, inundated by it. A curious aspect of this development, which does not aid the inner security of Protestant church groups, is that some secularized Protestants tend to identify Catholicism with the older orthodox tradition of Christianity, something certainly in no way encouraged by official Protestantism. When such people feel guilt—often not very consciously—for no longer believing what they were brought up to believe, they tend to project it outwards and to aggress Catholicism as the external visible surrogate of their former beliefs.

The hyper-reformationists see as their chief religious and civic task the carrying forward of the counter-

Catholic aspects of the Reformation in today's world. In fact, the very weakening of their Protestantism by secularization makes them more and not less anti-Catholic for the reasons I have suggested, and also because it is the one aspect of the long and honorable tradition of the Reformation that is meaningful to them in their present situation.

More pressing problems such as the very problematic future of all religion in American culture do not bother them despite their close relation to rational Protestant interests. By saving America from "Catholic aggression," this ideology once again identifies Protestantism with America and symbolically reaffirms the older, central role of Protestantism in our society.

This is, in fact, a symbolic counter-attack against the social rise of Catholics and the inevitably concomitant increasing visibility and influence of Catholicism. In some cases at least, it is also a way of handling guilt over an older, abandoned Protestant orthodoxy. This ideology, too, shows itself as employing a truncating stereotyping and as exhibiting militancy and rigidity. Like its Catholic counterpart, it goes in heavily for verbal realism.

Reality and Fantasy

Some will object that there is certainly some truth in what hyper-reformationism says about "Catholic authoritarianism," or in what hyper-integralism says about liberalism and Protestant "connivance" with secularism. Yes, of course. If they were

not built upon some reality, ideologies would not serve their function. The real bases exist in the complicated social developments we have briefly indicated and in the real and important faith and value differences that exist between Catholics and Protestants.

The neurotic individual who reacts to his boss in terms of unsolved infantile problems in relation to his father does not imagine that his boss is an authority figure who creates problems for him. This is part of the real situation. What he does is to perceive this realistic element in a context derived from earlier and now inappropriate experiences. He adds unreal elements. In part he does this by schematizing the current situation in terms of the dimension of the earlier one. The perception is a distorted one and the reaction is over-determined. In the same way, these ideologists respond to their present predicaments with older and now inappropriate organizing ideas and actions. In both cases this is a disguised way of handling anxieties, wishes and aggressions.

These ideologies provide for each group a simplified and manageable definition of the situations in which they find themselves. They provide the self-image needed in a time of rapid transition to replace the older conventional images and definitions now being rendered obsolete by social change. The plight of the individual in a progressively complicated society also finds some fantasy expression as do frustrations and ag-

gressions of more purely personal origin.

It should be stressed that the anti-Romanism of the one and the anti-liberalism of the other are the sociological equivalents of the anti-Semitism of the German conservative classes who proved so vulnerable to Nazism. Why these ideologies appeal only to some elements among both religious groups and not to all is deserving of serious research. Undoubtedly some groups are more securely anchored in reality.

There are three reasons why I have considered at length these groups that are not representative of the typical Catholic or Protestant. First, they should not be underestimated; they are not a lunatic fringe. There are hard cores on both sides, and around them cluster all shades of affected opinion.

Second, these groups should be a problem to intelligent Catholics and Protestants. It is important that they do not come to act as foci for the crystallization of American opinion.

Third, these ideologies play an important part in structuring the framework in which a great deal of exchange of ideas takes place. The exchanges are often marked by considerable intensity. Issues like education, birth control, an ambassador to the Vatican, or a Catholic President arouse the hyper-reformationists.

Their Catholic counterparts are in fact likely to remain calmer and more rational on these issues, which

they see more realistically and less symbolically. They tend to get triggered off by such symbolic counters as communism, which plays the role of master-symbol for many of them; criticism of the F.B.I. or Alger Hiss speaking at Princeton, over which a Catholic chaplain becomes so exercised. Some symbols are shared in common, and in local contexts any of the long list may become the catalyst to set things off.

Fortunately, these two ideologies are not organized around the same symbols, and their adherents do not face each other as two quite polarized groups reacting with equal intensity to the same issues. The loosely integrated character of American society and culture helps account for this fact.

It is ironical that neither group seems aware that both constitute striking examples of the secularization of their religious ethos. If the hyper-integralists see no inconsistency in championing a Catholicism that has centered its ethic upon *caritas* ("charity," cf. I Cor. 13) and, at the same time, in embracing Joseph McCarthy as a sterling defender of the cause, the hyper-reformationists see nothing anti-Protestant in the crude secularism of Paul Blanshard on so many ethical issues. Each confuses religion and secular nationalism in its own way.

Thus the hyper-integralists tend to merge loosely into rightist secular political groupings, a fact that reaffirms their Americanism for them. The hyper-reformationists also merge

loosely, in some cases at least, with quite militant secularizers.

Certain conservative Protestant groups today appear to be taking up a line like the hyper-integralists. As recent events in the South have shown, the identification of conservative and defensive religion with right-wing causes is not a Catholic monopoly. Will the hyper-reformationists reconcile themselves with their Catholic equivalents on the basis of a secular rightism and find themselves combating fellow Protestants?

Reality-Testing via Dialog

An important effect of the existence of these ideologies is, as I have noted, that they tend to define the universe of discourse for more moderate people. The result is a great lack of reality-testing about controversial issues. To give but one example: it is surprising to what a great extent the discussion of a possible Catholic President is marked by tenseness and lack of sense of proportion. The symbolic elements outweigh the real in the thinking of so many otherwise sensible people.

It seems clear to any political realist that no Catholic President would or could alter the American Constitution, either as a document or as a body of practices embodying and interpreting that document. Certainly this is one area where formal and informal control seems quite effective.

Indeed, anyone with an ounce of political shrewdness knows that the Catholic Church as a religious group

would have far less influence upon a Catholic President than upon almost any other conceivable administration. The social controls are such that he would lean over backwards to avoid even the suggestion of influence. In France members of the clergy were much freer in approaching high government officials under distinctly secular cabinets than they were when MRP, a liberal Catholic party, had formed the government.

Every issue of this kind picks up connotations that find resonance in Catholic and Protestant souls, reactivating memories of our unfortunate and most unChristian history of fighting and persecuting one another—triggering off our often unconscious and, too often, equally unChristian anxieties about our present predicaments. These foreshortened attempts to handle a reality we have not really faced are in fact an unwary abandonment of reality.

Nonrational fears and aggressions replace Christian action: symbolic concerns replace real ones; rational dialog becomes impossible.

Reality-testing must be developed, but reality-testing is not an individual process. It is a social affair in which the slants of men with different perspectives partly correct and partly supplement each other, eliminating fantasy and enlarging the range of the real. It requires communication, the basis of which should exist in a common Christian heritage.

In isolation, each group finds it difficult to recognize in its own view the elements of fantasy and projection that creep in. That is why Protestant-Catholic dialog is so important. It has already started in theological discussions and in biblical studies. There is much room for creative thinking in extending it. Only dialog will deliver us from the spell of the ideologues.

III

A Catholic View of American Protestantism

WILLIAM CLANCY

IF THERE be a Christian commandment, it is surely the commandment of love. "By this," Jesus told us, "will all men know that you are my disciples, if you love one another." But if the standard of this

commandment were strictly applied, we would find few "Christians" in any age. As for the situation in America today, Reinhold Niebuhr has accurately observed: "The relations between Catholics and Prot-

estants in this country are a scandal and an offense against Christian charity."

The scandal of our Protestant-Roman Catholic relations may, of course, be inevitable. Only the Saints approach the sublimity of Christ's commandment of love. The rest of us are conditioned by our own prejudices, and all of us—Catholics and Protestants—are heirs to a four-hundred-year history of suspicion and, even, dislike. Looking at the relations of Catholics and Protestants in many parts of Europe, however, one would have to be a pessimist indeed to doubt that the situation here could be improved.

"Coherence" vs. "Incoherence"

The editors of this journal have asked me to contribute a Roman Catholic's—a *particular* Roman Catholic's—view of American Protestantism. In thinking about this, I see again that objectivity comes hard. We are all (I repeat) conditioned by our own prejudices. For most Catholics, Protestantism is a peculiarly inexplicable phenomenon. And though many of my coreligionists may disagree with some things I say in this article, I think they will agree with this: for most Catholics, an ordered skepticism is easier to understand than Protestantism. Obviously this is not an easy or a pleasant fact for a Catholic to admit, especially when he is writing for a primarily Protestant audience. But it is true, and it indicates something profound about Catholic-Protestant difficulties.

James Joyce expressed this classically in a famous passage toward the end of *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*, where Stephen Dedalus (Joyce himself) tells his friend Cranly that he is abandoning Catholicism:

"Then—said Cranly—you do not intend to become a Protestant?"

"I said I had lost the faith—Stephen answered—but not that I had lost self-respect. What kind of liberation would that be to forsake an absurdity which is logical and coherent and to embrace one which is illogical and incoherent?"

However arrogant this passage may sound to Protestants, I think they should realize that Joyce was here expressing something more profound than Catholic prejudice or Irish insularity. He was stating a conviction almost universally held among Catholics, that there is no alternative to the Church of Rome except disbelief. For most Catholics, Protestantism, with its innumerable divisions, seems at best compromise and at worst chaos. Our own concept of the Church, with its system and logic, its tradition and order, does not prepare us for sympathy with any version of Christianity less "certain" or more ambiguous than our own. We are apt to see in Protestantism a mere shadow-Christianity, the sad example of what happens once the objectivity of Catholic authority is overthrown.

I would not argue here whether this is good or bad, but it has important consequences for Catholic-Protestant relations on almost every level. Since Catholics tend to see

Protestantism as mere negation, mere *anti*-Catholicism, they tend also not to take it seriously as a genuine *Christian* concern, even in the social and political orders. From this fact much of the religious misunderstanding in our pluralist society results.

One outstanding and discouraging fact about the Catholic-Protestant situation in America is that, on the popular level at least, most of our controversies are conducted on the level of caricature. The Protestant caricature of Catholicism is a monolith called "Romanism," which is authoritarianism pure and simple. The Catholic caricature of Protestantism is that mere negation, that compromise-Christianity, which it is so easy to dismiss. Because of these caricatures, Protestants approach Catholicism with unreasoning suspicion, and Catholics view Protestantism with fatuous condescension. Thus are the real issues evaded.

Both caricatures are obviously sins against charity and truth, and the first object of any Catholic-Protestant encounter should be to destroy them. But before this can be done, each group must admit, quite honestly, its own responsibility for creating and maintaining the caricatures. Catholics must take some of the blame for their own part in maintaining that "monolithic" caricature of the Church which they deplore. And Protestants must acknowledge their responsibility for presenting a spectacle of negativism and anti-Catholicism on the American scene.

I do not believe that Catholics generally have anything that approaches an adequate understanding of what Protestantism actually is. Most of them know only what it is *not*. And this is a major failure in Catholic education.

I recall my own education. It was in Catholic schools from the first grade through my master's degree, and I am most grateful for it. But I am not grateful for what it taught me—or, more accurately, for what it failed to teach me—about Protestantism.

In primary and secondary schools I learned the standard things, all negative: Protestants reject the authority of the Pope; they do not honor the Virgin; they deny the efficacy of good works; they acknowledge only two sacraments, etc. In the college that I attended I learned nothing more. (But the history department offered a two-semester course under the interesting title, "The Protestant Revolt and the Catholic Reformation.") Through eighteen years of Catholic education I heard nothing positive about Protestantism: no teacher ever suggested that, beyond the Reformation's negations, Protestantism has a prophetic vision of its own vocation. (I would note here my suspicion that, in the teaching of Roman Catholicism, Protestant schools do no better.)

If the religious situation in America is to improve, Catholics must understand—better than they have in the past—that Protestantism has its own unique genius, that it wit-

nesses to some of the central truths of Christianity, that, at its best, it is moved by a special sense of God's awful majesty and a special jealousy for his sovereign rights. And Catholics can admit these things even though they must finally judge Protestantism to be separated from the Church's visible unity and doctrinally incomplete.

More than this, a Catholic can be thankful for the witness Protestantism bears to some aspects of Christian truth and the Christian vocation that, at various times in the Roman Church's history, may be obscured. I, for one, am grateful to Methodism for the witness it bears to the life-giving action of the Holy Spirit, and to Presbyterianism for its careful guarding of "the Crown Rights of the Redeemer"; I am grateful to Anglicanism for its deep sense of seemliness and order in worship, to Lutheranism for its emphasis on the grace of God, and to the Congregational Churches for their special awareness of the responsibility of the local community of believers in the total life of Christianity. I am grateful to Protestantism generally for its devotion to the prophetic ministry of the Church.

God does work in mysterious ways, and the Catholic should see the hand of God in all these things. One of John Henry Newman's most moving letters was that in which he declared, after many years as a Catholic, that he would "never" attack the Anglican Church. How, he asked, can any Catholic attack a community in which so much of

God's truth is proclaimed and so much evidence of His grace is seen?

The faces of Protestantism in America are more various, probably, than in any other country; the various gifts of Protestantism are consequently more manifest here, too. I hope it will not seem ungracious of me to say that, because of this, Protestantism's special defects are perhaps more evident here than in any other place. What the American Catholic sees when he looks at Protestantism are often, unfortunately, those things about which Protestantism can be least proud: a narrow moralism, anti-Catholicism and what I would describe as a kind of crypto-Erastianism. (I would be the first to admit that, when he looks at Catholicism in America, the Protestant may well see evidence to confirm *his* worst suspicions of the Church of Rome: clerical paternalism and a philistine anti-intellectualism. But this is not the subject of my article.)

The Intellect vs. The Will

Theologically and historically, Protestantism and Catholicism are separated by disagreements that—except for Divine intervention—will probably never be healed. There will never be a Protestant Catholic Church, nor will there ever be a Catholic Protestant Church, at least in any sense that a Roman Catholic could admit. But of all the differences between the two traditions, few are more significant than the primacy each tradition assigns to the intellect and to the will.

The Catholic tradition stands eternally for the primacy of the intellect over the will, of the logos over the ethos; historic Protestantism has tended to be voluntaristic, to give primacy to the will. For a Catholic, goodness is for the sake of truth; for most Protestants, truth is for the sake of goodness. There seems little doubt that the intense moralism of modern Protestantism is a result of this ordering. The Protestant, almost by self-definition, is a "good" man; the Catholic, by self-definition, is a man who holds the truth.

I have no intention of discussing here the merits of either tradition, but both, obviously, have their effects in social and cultural life, and both have their temptations. If the natural temptation for the Catholic—with his assurance of "truth"—is an arrogant dogmatism, the natural temptation for the Protestant—with his concern for "virtue"—is a puritanical moralism. This is the temptation, I believe, to which a good portion of American Protestantism has succumbed, and because our culture is a predominantly Protestant culture, the American ethos has succumbed to it too.

This obviously is not something about which a Catholic has any right to complain. One cannot reasonably "blame" a culture for the way it has developed. What a Catholic does have a right to complain of, however, is the assumption among large numbers of American Protestants that their own version of morality—which a Catholic

sees as a sectarian-puritan version—is in some way part of the American-way-of-life. There is a great irony in the fact that those Protestant groups that are most keen on "separation" of the Church and State and most worried about the Catholic "threat" to separation, are also the groups that would impose a Protestant ethos on the community through civil law, wherever possible. The absolute prohibition of drinking and gambling through civil legislation is, of course, the major example of this.

How is this achieved, this identification of a Protestant puritanism with Americanism itself, by men sincerely devoted to "separation" of Church and State? I suspect it is by what I have called a kind of crypto-Erastianism among many American Protestants. Historically, Protestants have often embraced an Erastian theory of Church-State identification. In this country they are, overwhelmingly, in favor of Church-State separation. In many cases, though, they seem to be in favor of separation as a weapon against "Rome." They are for separation of the Church from what they still assume to be an implicitly Protestant State.

All this is, of course, on the level of emotion. It would not, could not, be defended rationally. But I think it is operative—and significantly operative—nonetheless. On the subconscious level many Protestants still think of the United States as *their* country and fight to keep it so. But they do not see this as a violation

of separation: they are fighting to keep America "American," by which they mean Protestant in its predominant mores and symbols.

I realize that I am here criticizing a phenomenon that is dying. The most responsible voices in American Protestantism have for many years been warning against the assumption that Protestantism is somehow *the* American religion and that Catholics and Jews are not quite in the club. But it takes time for popular sentiment to catch up with intellectual perception, and Catholics of my generation still feel the heavy hand of Protestant "purity" upon us in many areas of American life.

We still feel, too, the sharp cut of anti-Catholicism, even when it is "civilized," patronizing and well-meant. I would not trouble the reader by pointing to the more primitive expressions of anti-Catholicism that still exist in our land and are reflected in some popular Protestant journalism—and also in some recent Gallup polls. This does not bother me or, I think, most Catholics. It is vestigial; it is almost—but not quite—dead. What does bother me a good deal is the challenge, still given us, to "prove" our Americanism, and we hear this challenge even at "advanced" inter-faith gatherings. I, for one, am very tired of explaining

that, no, I *really* feel no conflict between my Americanism and my Catholicism. The day is rapidly coming—I think it has come for me—when American Catholics will refuse to answer such challenges, no matter how well they are meant, and will return them as insults.

What I hope for in American Protestantism is that it continue to move in the direction it is now moving—away from sectarianism, from a narrow moralism and an obsessive anti-Catholicism—toward re-emphasis on those things that are great and profound in its own tradition. I hope it will worry less about "Rome" and about such, in my view, inane issues as an ambassador to the Vatican, and more about the real danger it faces in making too cozy an alliance with the forces of American secularism. I hope Protestantism deepens its own best heritage: that its renewed concern for the Church and the Sacraments, for Christian unity and ecumenical encounter are the signs of its future. I hope that both Catholics and Protestants will increasingly realize that we have much to learn from each other. Because, though the achievement of Christian unity must wait upon God's good time, we are all, even now, baptized in the same Christ.

The liturgical movement drives on relentlessly but horizontally. It goes round in circles, repeating itself uncreatively. What it has failed to do is to plunge in a vertical direction, into a new creative dimension of depth.

A Re-examination of the Liturgical Movement*

FATHER WILLIAM, O.C.D.
Editor, SPIRITUAL LIFE

I HAVE just finished my second reading of Father Charles Magsam's book, *The Inner Life of Worship* (St. Meinrad, Ind., Grail, 300 pp., \$4.50).

It is a book about man's first duty—to worship God. "A Christian's first duty is to worship in and through and with Christ to the glory of the Trinity. Worship is our all-pervading duty; it touches life at every point; it is just as essential to every part of life as it is to mystical and to eternal union with God."

Faith is the foundational, sub-structural virtue of the whole spiri-

tual life. Charity is the greatest virtue. But we cannot love what we do not know. And it is by faith that we know God. Now you can see the importance of Father Magsam's book as well as the essential virtue of worship, because every chapter of the book is a clear, compelling witness to the fact that "worship is faith prayed."

Faith gathers all the aspects of truth into a single commitment to the living Word of God, it gathers the three theological virtues into an adequate response of the whole man, and the whole man is gathered

*Reprinted from *Spiritual Life*, 1233 So. 45th St., Milwaukee 14, Wis., June, 1959.

by the body of Christ in the Eucharist into the whole body of Christ on earth. Outside of the Mystical Body there is no salvation. In faith, in the sacraments, in the Church man can rise to the highest states of divine union: mystical marriage or transforming union.

The *intensive* treatment of worship as the expression of a deep, mysterious and ever growing faith does not make the author's view of liturgy less extensive. There are chapters on the scope of worship, the use of reason, voice and hands in worship, Mary, the father of the family, sacraments and sacramentals, the Mass, union with God, union with men, personality, action and missions. All of this is written with fresh insight and clear style for the layman who wants to know how worship fits into the context of his life as a Catholic.

The emphasis, however, is not on what is evident and palpable to the majority—that is, that liturgy corresponds to a very human need—but on the inner realities which inform the outward ceremonial, of which the latter is but the imperfect expression. What distinguishes Catholic liturgy from all other forms of worship is not its material and human element, with which liturgy is bound up, but sanctifying grace and the presence of the Holy Spirit by which it lives.

Father Magsam is not a specialist in any branch of theology or philosophy. He is a Maryknoll missionary and an assistant novice master. Perhaps this accounts for the felici-

tous fact that his book is delightfully free of an excessive and narrow concentration of thought, of pedantry, repetition and nonessential, boring trivialities.

The Maryknoll author is, on the contrary, perfectly balanced. His range of thought has a broad, rich sweep to it; it is clear, unencumbered, unprejudiced. His style is terse, incisive, but beautiful. His sources are varied and plentiful. His content is made up of vastly important material which, until now, we could find only in scattered places—in Scripture, the Fathers, the encyclicals, the classics, the best modern spiritual writers.

Of all the English books on worship to grow out of the liturgical movement in America *The Inner Life of Worship* is, without a doubt, the most profound and mature. In fact, the publication of this book ought to be regarded as a singular and significant event in the history of the liturgical revival in the United States. It introduces a whole *new dimension*—one long and painfully missed in the liturgical movement: the dimension of depth. This new dimension is the author's real contribution. To appreciate it, you have to evaluate the book against the background of the liturgical movement.

What is the liturgical movement? "The liturgical movement is one name for all those interconnected and interdependent works being carried on in the Church today whose aim is to restore to the faithful their rightful inheritance of a fully sac-

ramental Catholic life, centered in active, common participation in the sacred mysteries and in the public, solemn prayer of the Church. It is the universal program of the Church, restated by the popes, for all the faithful as members of one Body; a program based solidly on the facts of the faith, with the practical efficacy of the Holy Spirit Himself who guides and inspires the faith and worship of the Church" (*What is the Liturgical Movement?*, published by the Liturgical Conference).

Based on Pope St. Pius X's famous statement that: "The primary and indispensable source of the true Christian spirit is active participation in the sacred mysteries and in the public, solemn prayer of the Church," and launched in this country in the 1920's, the liturgical movement has been one of the most significant spiritual forces of our age.

It reached its zenith when Pope Pius XII, who said, "The most pressing duty of Christians is to live the liturgical life," took over the leadership of the movement and wrote his famous liturgical encyclicals and reformed liturgical rites and laws. The movement has three major purposes:

1. To cultivate a deep appreciation of the Mass, the central act of Christian worship, the central action of Christian life.

2. To foster active internal and external participation in the Mass by the laity according to the mind and regulations of the Church.

3. To build up a deep love and understanding of the sacraments, the liturgical year, the sacramentals and

the prayer of the Church, organized around the celebration of the Holy Eucharist and so constituting both the pattern and the force of Christian life and action.

These efforts have borne great fruit. Intelligent, active participation in the liturgy is growing among laymen all over the country, and a divinizing and humanizing process is taking place. People in pursuit of perfection are legion, and they are being much more theological, positive and objective about it. Their growth is more gradual, gracious, more human. They are more wholesomely God-centered, Christ-conscious. They are more concerned about the rest of humanity and about temporal affairs; and thus they are more inclined toward social action and apostolic endeavors.

It is evident, then, that a great deal has been done by the liturgical movement in our country. It is also evident to some, who have given sufficient thought to the matter, that much more could be done and must be done. If left undone, the movement will no longer move, will, in fact, stagnate and perhaps do more harm than good. A cessation of movement has almost been an observable fact within the past few years. It would seem as if the liturgical movement has met an impasse.

There is a dull, droning repetition of principles, programs, and slogans with which the movement began in the 1920's. It is understandable that the subject matter of the organs and conventions of the

movement would be limited extensively, *but not intensively*.

That, it seems to me, is the trouble. The movement drives on relentlessly but *horizontally*; and so it goes around in circles, repeating itself uncreatively. What it has failed to do is to plunge into a *vertical* direction, into a new, creative dimension of *depth*. In other words, the liturgical movement in the United States suffers from *immaturity* (which is no great sin or no cause for condemnation; it is merely a stage of growth; but it must be known and faced and managed). What are some of the signs of immaturity?

First Sign

To say or to act as if "the liturgy is everything," or to present it as an end instead of a means. Such statements and attitudes are directly opposed to Pope Pius XII's *Mediator Dei*. And they disclose a very narrow and incorrect theological perspective.

Religion without *essential* religious experience (contemplation) is a corpse. A liturgy or a Christian doctrine that does not express or embody contemplation (an experiential awareness of God) is a truncated liturgy, an effete doctrine. It is ecclesiastical materialism. Religion is mysticism (man's conscious Godward trend) because religion is the right relation, the relation of union between man and God, and mysticism means that and only that.

There is something in man which longs for the Perfect and the Unchanging, and is sure, in spite of the

confusions, the evils, the rough and tumble of life, that the Perfect and the Unchanging is the Real. This longing and this certainty are latent in everyone, in a more or less rudimentary condition, and they are the best clue we have, apart from revelation, of the mysterious nature of man and the true meaning of prayer. Now, it is part of the business of public worship (liturgy) to arouse and feed this Godward hunger, and to make us more completely human, more alive.

The unfortunate result of an unbalanced emphasis of liturgy is that the majority of people do not reach the perfect union of the love of God, as far as it is possible in this life, that union called by the mystics "spiritual marriage" between the human person and the Son of God, the Spouse, wherein each is surrendered to the other by total possession one of the other in the consummated union of love, insofar as it may be in this life, in which the soul is made divine and becomes God by participation.

Why is this state attained only by a minority of Christians? St. John of the Cross, gifted and experienced Carmelite psychologist, says it is because "few have the knowledge and desire to enter into this full detachment and emptiness of spirit." Again, he refers to those who "will not or know not how to go," but by the way of "sweetness of spirit or sense," and that God condescends to them, granting them that which is not best for them because of the ignorance or unwillingness by which

"they are unable to partake of the stronger and more solid food of the labors of the Cross of His Son" (*Ascent of Mt. Carmel*, II, XXI, S).

It is possible to bury Christianity's basic principles so deeply beneath a weight of what are supposed to be practical applications, that the essential thing is almost lost to view. For instance, we have it on the word of Christ Himself, that the sum total of religion is to love God above all things and to love our neighbor as ourselves. No one disputes this. But many do, apparently, overlook the fact that a lifetime is not long enough to achieve its fullness or penetrate its meaning. Toward the realization of this goal, it is not enough to suggest attending Mass and frequenting the sacraments. This will not answer the ever recurring, vitally absorbing questions: Who is God? What is love?

Many other means are required—like hours of mental prayer, periods of solitude and silence, mortification and spiritual reading, spiritual direction, etc. Pat answers, *simpliste* views and panaceas are always signs of immaturity.

Second Sign

To suggest that the works of St. John of the Cross are out of date, are, in fact, dangerous, too introspective and psychological. Such a statement evidences either a misunderstanding of John of the Cross or a misconception of the spiritual life. It also indicates a failure to realize or respect the fact that St. John is the Doctor of Spiritual Theology.

Would it not be less *divisive*, more constructive for liturgists to take St. John's psychological map of the spiritual life which is a singular, exquisite, incomparable contribution based on Scripture, sound theology, incontrovertible philosophy and mystical experience—I say, take his psychological analysis and plow it back (actually, St. John never took it out) into the sacramental, mystical life of the Church?

In the United States men like Fathers H. A. Reinhold and Thomas Merton have opened the door on occasions toward such a needful integration. Father Conrad Pepler is doing this in England, Father Danielou and Father Marie Eugène and others in France. They do believe most firmly that the marriage between the sign and its concrete meaning, the *signum* and the *res*, is absolute and indissoluble, and that until the pair are united in conjugal fidelity, the mystical teaching will remain up in the air.

What many (of even the leading) exponents of the liturgical movement do not seem to know, however, is that St. John of the Cross, the psychologist of the spiritual life of whom they are so wary, was in fact also a liturgist—his whole goal being the very same as the liturgical movement's, namely: the transformation of man into Christ, the perfect priest and victim. His own spiritual life was based solidly on the liturgy and expressed magnificently through the liturgy. Every other sentence of St. John of the Cross is a scriptural sentence.

The "dark nights" of St. John are not meant to reject or destroy anything human or natural but to purify them and prepare the way for a further unification of all things within the unimpeded light of the eternal presence. He was a poet as well as a mystic. He had never forsaken the things of sense, but he was detached from them.

With his rigorous insistence on absolute detachment went a concrete experience of the "whole Christ" and consistent use of the mystical language of the Bible and of nature. St. John possessed a rare and exact knowledge of man. He knew man's need for symbols and for mystery and so he would not dare strip him of the sign or *sacramentum* and feed him only on pure doctrine and utter reality. That would not only be bad theology but also bad psychology.

It is surprising to find men unimpressed by the voice of the mystics and more confident of their own abstract speculation. "The efforts of the mystics to translate their mystical experience into intelligible language," writes Father Arintero, "are of greater value and give us a better understanding of the ineffable mysteries of the spiritual life than what could be taught by speculative theology, which views these mysteries externally and only through the investigations of reason."

Third Sign

A devaluation of personal devotion, mental prayer and contemplation. This is more frequently done

by implication than by direct expression. These activities of the spiritual life are not ordinarily openly denounced in the organs and conventions of the liturgical movement; but neither are they ordinarily discussed. The theme for the 1957 Liturgical Convention was *Liturgy and Education*. The word "contemplation" does not even appear on the program. It was brought up in one of the workshops and did little but stir up consternation, confusion and opposition. And yet, Plato, Aristotle, Thomas Aquinas and John of the Cross all agree that contemplation is the end of education. The theme for the 1958 Liturgical Convention was *The Liturgical Year*. It was an excellent opportunity to integrate the "three ways" with the rhythm of the Church Year. Nothing was said; nothing but a negative, disparaging, passing remark by one of the main speakers to the effect that the "three ways" was a canonization of Gnosticism and Platonism.

Liturgical enthusiasts are very disinclined to give much attention to the personal element of religion. They seem obsessed with a fear of individualism. Little profit can be gained by labeling whole epochs as "individualist" because their outstanding religious personalities seem to have taken the liturgical life of the Church for granted, or by using the papal condemnation of a nineteenth-century error for chiding the people of a twentieth-century need. Man will always be plagued by egoism and self-centeredness, but the big issue of today is not individual-

ism, but its opposite, communism and all forms of totalitarianism.

We have witnessed in this century a violent revulsion from an individualistic form of religion. The community, now, is the sacred thing. Religion is a social affair. All valid knowledge of God is social. He is chiefly known in man not apart from man. The use of prayer is mainly social. It improves us for service, otherwise it must be condemned as a merely selfish activity. This of course is an exaggeration, a mutilation of the gospel of religion and of prayer. It weakens religion by wiping away the absolute character of spiritual values.

If the swing over to a purely social interpretation of religion be allowed to continue unchecked, the result can be only an impoverishment of our spiritual life; and it will be as far-reaching and as regrettable as an unbridled individualism.

Fourth Sign

The effort to discredit and discard the traditional "three ways" of the spiritual life—purgation, illumination and union.

Is it wise to discard the "three ways" because they are "accidental and artificial divisions inspired by Platonic influence"? Does the Church not take great pains to establish her most substantial truths within the protective walls of an accidental and artificial framework? And must we suspect or disparage the culture of the Western Church because of Greco-Roman influence? Can we so lightly discard what has proved to

be the most clarifying division that has become common property of the great spiritual writers and Doctors of the Church?

The most important question of all is: Just how accidental and artificial is this division? The "three ways" seem inextricably bound up with nature and fundamental to the movement of the whole universe. It seems to fit all levels of our life—natural, ritualistic and spiritual. All unfold according to the same rhythm.

It would seem to be far more reasonable and far more in keeping with the mind of the Church to use and explain the "three ways" not in isolation, not artificially, not abstractly, but in the context of the whole man and the whole universe. This positive procedure will not only save mysticism from the unbalanced specialization of the theoretical mystics, but will save liturgy from the unbalanced specialization of the liturgists.

One of the questions still unanswered even by Magsam's book is this: Has the divorce between the ritual level of man's Christian life and his natural level become so complete that the natural level is today necessarily artificial? It is perhaps for this reason (the absolute divorce between ritual and natural life) that the average man finds little appeal in the ordinary liturgical functions, and why there has to be so much encouragement for people to enter into the spirit of the liturgy.

Should our efforts be expended toward compelling or persuading

people to adhere to symbols that no longer clearly symbolize, or should we lead them back to nature so that the sacramental sign will be significant, or should we plead for new signs that not only *effect* what they (vaguely) signify, but (clearly) *signify* what they effect?

A good book always raises many questions. This should not obscure the more important fact that many other questions have been answered. This is especially true of *The Inner Life of Worship*. We have waited a long time for these pressing questions to be answered with quiet wisdom, keen precision and theological balance. We are impressed with Father Magsam's masterful performance, and are deeply indebted to this wise man of Maryknoll.

It is really important that the dimension of depths begun by Father Magsam does not peter out. If it is to continue, then the contributions of the men of various religious orders will have to be more Catholic than, for instance, Benedictine, Carmelite, or Jesuit. A long view, a broad, rich universality, born of a full-grown, worldly-grounded theological perspective will be indispensable. The activities of mystics and liturgists will have to be co-ordinated; and they will have to abandon the excessive specialization into which everyone has fallen.

In fact, we are fortunate to live in an age when we have the opportunity (and duty) to link up all the ancient heritage of liturgical devotion, growing as it does out of the

focal doctrine of the Mystical Body of Christ, with the more modern concentration on mysticism which is really of the same Spirit but which has appeared to be distinct.

There is no purpose to continuing the tension created by the disparate schools of thought. The present time already has the one single advantage that can result from such tension: a complete revolution in the exposition of ascetical-mystical theology. But this cannot result from rashness, prejudice, unbalance and precipitancy. With this caution in mind, it seems safe and right to say that the numerous categories of the modern treatises with their elaborate scales and stages have to be rethought in terms of the total mystery of the Word of God.

Distinction for the Sake of Unity

The signs of immaturity discussed thus far exist, it seems to me, because many leaders of the liturgical movement fail to give sufficient attention to the distinction and interrelation of the theological virtues and the virtue of religion. Liturgists are loath to define liturgy in any exact sense or to attribute to it a limited function. They love—and this is admirable—to co-ordinate and synthesize; and the liturgy is regarded as the best possible tool for these purposes. The trouble is that, when co-ordination of the manifold elements of the spiritual life are pursued without proper subordination of the same elements to one another, confusion is inevitable. Synthesis presupposes analysis.

St. Thomas performs this analytical service well. But it seems more fitting, here, to quote a Benedictine, Dom Aelred Graham. After discussing liturgical prayer (and mental prayer too) as an activity of the moral virtue of religion, he says: "On the terrain of religion, of the worship and service of God, vocal prayer holds primacy of place. Through religion we pay to God the debt of justice we owe Him as His creatures. . . . But our relationship to God is not only one of servitude; we are His friends as well as His servants. Our friendship with God brings us into the realm of His own peculiar dominion of the soul, the activity of the theological virtues and the gifts of the Holy Spirit.

"Religion is always concerned with God, but *indirectly*, that is, through the medium of something else. The theological virtues and the gifts, on the other hand, are concerned with God *directly*, without any created medium. An act of faith, or of love, is not a directing or offering of something to God, whether it be the expression of a need or the dedication of some material object, but a direct aspiration towards Him of the intellect or will. In practice, of course, religion and the theological virtues mutually interact: acts of religion will normally be influenced by faith and charity and these will find their external expression in prayer and worship and the other activities of religion. Notwithstanding this they are different virtues and the distinction among them has practical implications to be recog-

nized, not indeed by the operation of some virtues to the exclusion of the rest, but by the predominance of certain among them—with the result that the individual's spiritual life becomes, as it were, characterized by their activity. Thus the virtue most clearly revealed in the life of St. Benedict was religion; in that of St. Thomas Aquinas, faith joined with wisdom; in St. Ignatius, perhaps supernatural prudence.

"Infused contemplation, the theologians teach, is not an activity of the virtue of religion and is not therefore prayer in the sense described above; it is rather an actualization of the virtues of faith and charity with the co-operation of the gift of wisdom. So considered, it is a higher and nobler operation of the individual soul than prayer, even than the common prayer of the liturgy."

In the light of these principles, one can more easily understand how the liturgy, which is formal, official and prescribed, is not always the best means, the richest environment, for the intense actuation of the theological virtues. In other words, liturgical worship, regarded strictly, does not involve in itself enough silence, aloneness and personal freedom to allow us to respond to our Lord's invitation to behave as friends.

One can also see how modern methods of mental prayer can, in fact, be worthwhile substitutes for a "full" liturgical diet of worship. The exercises of St. Ignatius have led so many to sanctity and to an

unusually successful apostolate, that even apart from high ecclesiastical approval, their efficacy is proved beyond dispute. And there is no doubt that they prepare the soul for contemplation, which in turn is the greatest possible contribution to liturgical worship. Contemplative prayer, stripped of image and apperception, idle in appearance and yet so active, *is the adoration, truly worthy of God*, wherein the soul unites herself to Him. Did not St. Ignatius say that the whole diet of man is to "praise, reverence and serve God our Lord"?

While it is necessary, in order to avoid a *simpliste* view of the spiritual life, that we distinguish the theological virtues from religion,

contemplation from prayer, it is of equal importance that we should not erect an unreal dichotomy between them. A departmentalized spirituality is no less a misfortune than one that is oversimplified. Charity is not religion and religion is not charity, but charity can be religious and religion can be informed with charity. Contemplation and liturgical worship are not the same things but they can, and obviously should, exist harmoniously together.

Liturgy and contemplation are not two separate ways to union with God. They are two necessary aspects of one, single, integrated response of the human being to a God who loves him.



Social Action and the Liturgy

Over two decades ago Dom Virgil Michel wrote: "The entire life of the true Christian . . . must be a reflection and a further expression of his life at the altar of God, at the true source of the Christian spirit. If he is predominantly a passive Christian there, can we expect him to be an active Christian in his daily life out in the world?"

This is why those who are deeply interested in the social apostolate eventually also become interested in the liturgical apostolate, and vice-versa. For the two are cut from the same cloth. They need each other. And the Church needs both of them. Because the impact the Church will have on the world in the future depends to a great degree on the work of apostolic laymen in the temporal sphere and the degree to which these laymen make the liturgy the center of their lives.—AVE MARIA, May 2, 1959.

The free world has thus far failed to demonstrate that the Communist onslaught is not irresistible and that communism is not, after all, the irreversible wave of the future.

East, West and the Cold War*

CHARLES MALIK
President, UN General Assembly

PEOPLE have little leisure today to reflect on the ultimate things. Some of them have even lost the capacity for such reflection, so that it would make little difference even if they had plenty of leisure. In the hour-to-hour and day-to-day attention to immediate demands we often lose sight of the grand design. Nothing is more reinvigorating and necessary than to recapture as authentic a vision of what is really at stake in the world situation today as possible. Without such a vision we can never be certain that in the daily discharge of our duties we are not really serving those forces whose

aim is the destruction of the very values we wish to defend and promote.

There are two standpoints from which this perspective can be sought: the standpoint of history and the standpoint of immediate judgment. We are asking in effect: what will history fifty or a hundred years from now say about what was at stake today, about the real questions in the balance, about whether my existence, whether your existence, helped or hindered or obscured the right issue. The difficulty of this approach is that the verdict of history will depend on who will

*An address delivered at the conferring of the Laetare Medal by the University of Notre Dame on Robert D. Murphy, Deputy Under Secretary of State, Washington, D.C., June 1, 1959.

write it. If one point of view prevails, then that point of view will justify itself in the history it will write. The most fundamental thing at stake today therefore is history itself, for the decisions we ourselves make determine how history will be written and what it will say as to what was really at stake. History is nothing but the creation of history, and the present is already determining how the future will view the present. This is why nothing is more awesome than immediate responsibility. We are thus forced back upon the standpoint of immediate judgment.

How can we ourselves tell what is really at stake? We can only do so on the basis of principle and conviction. What we affirm to be at stake reveals exactly what we believe and are. If we say nothing really important is at stake, then we have already disclosed that ours is a life of drift. If we only see an adjustment in Europe or an adjustment in the Middle East or an adjustment in the Far East at stake, then we have already exposed the extent of our analysis. If we only see economic matters at stake, such as the raising of the standard of living of this or that country or continent, then we have already displayed our economic determinism. If we only see the great social revolution in progress in Asia and Africa, then we have already declared our inability to face the revolution that is occurring or that should occur in our own lives. Nothing mirrors a man's soul more

accurately than his honest answer to the question as to what is at stake.

The Communist Menace

Behind and determining practically everything at stake today is the Communist menace. People have a way of congratulating themselves on the recent events in Tibet and Iraq because these events appear to have produced a wave of awakening in Asia and the Middle East. People also congratulate themselves on the independence of Yugoslavia from Moscow and on the retreat of communism in France, Italy, Greece and Iran since the War. These are great developments and they should be exploited to the full. But side by side with them consider the decisive advance of communism in continental China, the accomplishments of communism in Southeast Asia; the Communist infiltration of the Middle East, so electrifying that no important decision is taken today in or about the Middle East except as a function of the Communist thrust, whereas most certainly this was not the case ten years ago; the striking advance made by the Communist realm both in the economic and the technological fields; the superb activity of the Communist party throughout Asia, Africa and Latin America; and its stepped-up activity even in the United States, as some authoritative sources declared only last week.

To the complacent and comfortable I submit therefore the serious contemplation of the following ir-

reducible facts: 1) For forty-two years communism has never been pushed back or dislodged one inch from where it gained real political power. 2) It monolithically controls today about one-third of mankind. 3) It has penetrated in varying degrees the remaining two-thirds, so that the field of struggle of freedom with communism is actually in these two-thirds rather than in the realm of communism itself. 4) Its basic objective of communizing the world and destroying the values of freedom is absolutely unchanged. 5) That the Iron Curtain in Europe appears to be firmer than ever before. 6) It is now nineteen months since Sputnik I and the West appears to be still behind in that field.

I will accept comfort for what one can be fairly thankful, but only after these facts are faced honestly and in their light. I repeat, these are irreducible facts. When one fully grasps them, one is bound to conclude that the free world has not yet demonstrated that the Communist onslaught is not irresistible and that communism is not after all the irreversible wave of the future. This demonstration is one of the greatest things at stake today. Its importance is not all diminished by the indifference of the comfortable and complacent.

The Economic Realm

Great things are at stake in the economic realm. The average standard of living in the United States is thirty times that of Asia and Africa. Regardless of how it came

about, this fact by itself generates all sorts of rational and irrational tensions. And yet it is not easy to tackle this problem. There are economic, political and psychological limits to economic assistance, and even if one shared everything one owned with everybody else, still the problem is not solved. For people are happy only when they work and produce, and indeed when they work on and for that which they regard as their own.

It happens, however, that what they regard as their own is in some cases innately poor. While economic development therefore is absolutely necessary, and while it holds forth tremendous possibilities for the underdeveloped, there are objective human and material limits to such development. Some countries will never achieve a very high standard of living by their own resources. The tension therefore appears to be of the essence. How to live with such essential tension is one of the momentous issues at stake.

It may be that science in the future will resolve this issue. But science means universities, institutes, freedom of thought and inquiry, a whole scientific culture, and until the underdeveloped people accept, attain and sustain all that, their scientific salvation will have to come from the outside.

In the meantime strong governments have arisen to keep the lid down; but in the nature of the case this is a very precarious effort. Strong governments acting on restive populations without palpable

hope for real economic improvement would, even if they were the most benevolent to start with, sooner or later degenerate into tyrannies, and, to keep on bolstering their position, they would resort to all the tricks of demagoguery. The people will have to be fed on illusion and when illusion is a perpetual condition of survival it becomes national mythology. What is at stake here is the truth, namely, whether people can stand the real truth about themselves and their possibilities without a considerable dose of illusion. Illusion, and and therewith the suppression of freedom of thought and expression, becomes a studied instrument of stability.

To maintain a modicum of peace under these most trying conditions some international order, like that of the United Nations, is required under which the underdeveloped peoples would develop themselves in complete freedom, but with the temptation of aggrandizing at each other's expense reduced to a minimum. The economic necessities of the underdeveloped world generate a strong drive toward economic mergers transcending all narrow nationalism. And so we see how in this age of intense nationalism the very principle of nationalism itself is at stake.

The Question of War

Another fundamental question at stake today is war. I do not mean whether war will break out, but what kind of war. The very notion of war has become ambiguous. Now

in general a state of war exists whenever "the enemy" is identified and steps are taken to reduce or control or eliminate him. Until recently the term "war" has been applied only to "hot war," and even now when people speak of "war" they usually mean the fireworks. But the development in recent years of new methods of "taking steps against the enemy" has necessitated the distinction between "hot" and "cold" war. For the objective of reducing or controlling or eliminating the enemy can under modern conditions be reached through a variety of means short of armed conflict, and no nation will precipitate such a conflict if it can gain its objective without it. The new methods include "infiltration," "the softening up of the enemy from within," "subversion or indirect aggression," "fifth-columnism and the incitement of civil strife from abroad"—a whole host of measures which clever propaganda can take through the radio and the press and which disciplined and dedicated agents with lots of money at their disposal can administer through ruthless action by bribery or blackmail or intimidation or assassination or smear tactics or forged documents.

Thus, so far as war is concerned, this is not the age of the old legalistic notion of direct aggression. We speak of the critical world situation! A fundamental aspect of this situation is that everywhere there is a listening ear, a staring eye, a paid agent. This is not the age of war in the classical sense, but of infiltration

and indirect aggression; of espionage; of the softening up of the will and the resolve; of the undermining of character and morale; of slander and character assassination; of bribery and demoralization; of the manipulation of the press and the radio in the most vicious manner.

This is the age of the arousal of the darkest passions in man, the age of the dread mob spirit, the spirit of terror and revenge, the spirit that lives on scapegoats and personalities, on blood and sacrifice, that spirit that, to be placated and propitiated, demands a victim every day. It is like the dragon in the legend of Saint George who asked for a fair damsel every morning, and perhaps today also every evening; and believe me it takes someone like Saint George in the name of somebody higher than himself to stab and kill the modern dragon with his mighty sword.

In short, this is the age of cold war, and those who keep on talking about aggression and about territorial integrity and political independence, as though these were the real worries, are either naive or hypocrites or not living in this age or only using these terms as temporary expedients.

The result has been a general terrorization of people; they are afraid to stick out their neck; they are afraid to call things by their exact name; they voluntarily accept to be hypnotized and lulled; in fact, they practice the macabre art of self-hypnosis themselves; they say to

themselves, "Let somebody else do it, let somebody else take the blow, let me repair to some lee and hide myself in quiet." And he who has no adequate means of defending himself in this strange kind of warfare, in this brave new world, he who, for whatever reason, even if it be the best of reasons, is not able to retaliate in kind, is simply lost.

It is my opinion that the West is weak in this new kind of warfare; that it cannot congratulate itself because it has deterred aggression when the real question is whether it can deter subversion; and that of course communism will always carry out a peace offensive in the classical sense of no aggression when it is all the time waging a most successful war in the neo-classical sense of infiltration, neutralization and subversion.

What is really at stake today concerning war is not so much who will win the arms race, although that is most important, as the ability of the free world to win the cold war. The difficulty of this challenge should never cause one so to lose his patience as to think of hot war as the only way out. For that is no way out at all. But if communism persists in waging its own kind of war, as I believe it will, it ought to be beaten at its own game; and I believe it can be beaten without stooping to its methods.

The Values of the West

Western civilization is beleaguered today. It is called upon to justify itself. Its fundamental values are

not only denied and opposed by international communism and questioned by the awakened old cultures of Asia and Africa, but within its own ranks skepticism and unbelief are working havoc. So far as the Western world is concerned, the deepest thing at stake is its faith in its values and its ability to justify and defend them.

Can the Western world be conceived without the people freely electing and dismissing those who govern them? And yet it is that very principle of free representative government that is denied by communism and many another system.

Where would Western civilization be without the doctrine that the individual human person is the highest visible reality? And yet this is precisely what is denied, and the party or the system or the nation or some abstract set of ideas is put above man.

Where would Western civilization be without struggle and hard work and adventure and taking risks and some law by which people live? And yet look at the softness, and ease, and lawlessness, and refusal to take risks, and quest of pleasure and security, which infect the whole world.

Where would Western civilization be without the cumulative continuity of four or five thousand years of history, which enables the mind, in identifying itself with this whole stretch, to contemplate, for instance, the fourth century B.C. or the thirteenth century A.D. in itself and for itself, and to learn a great deal

from it? And yet history today is precisely the rejection of history, the chopping up of the past, the setting up of a multitude of arbitrary beginnings, the selection of only those themes and values that fit into preconceived frames.

Where would Western civilization be without the personal freedom to think and seek and speak and be? And yet in many parts of the world only the party or the dictator is free, and even this freedom is subservient to the lust for power and glory.

Where would the wonderful tradition of science and knowledge enshrined in the great universities be without the principle that there is a fixed, independent and attainable truth in every field of inquiry? And yet truth is regarded by many today as only that which serves the party or the nation or the revolution or the government, and the whole intellectual quest becomes the handmaid of power.

Where would Western civilization be without the immanent operation of a personal God? And yet the first principle of communism is precisely militant atheism, and in the pantheistic revivals elsewhere the personal character of God is altogether denied.

Free representative government, the primacy of the human person, the moral law, the continuity of history, freedom, truth, and God—it is these things that are at stake today. They are all rejected and opposed from without, and some of them are doubted or compromised

from within. Is life worth living without them? And yet if people do not wake up, life will not be worth living.

Today's Need

A mighty spiritual revival therefore is needed. For much more than peace is at stake. The revival must take hold not only of individuals here and there, but of whole institutions; not only of the leaders, but of the grass roots. The complacent and soft must be thoroughly shaken. When they congratulate themselves, they ought to congratulate themselves on real things. When they sit back and pontificate, they ought to be anxious how history will judge them fifty years from now. They ought to show that they and their culture are growing in the mastery of the deep and ultimate. They ought to prove that they are galvanized into a keen awareness of what is really at stake.

The ideal of a settled, successful, selfish life is wholly inadequate. One craves to see great themes sought and discussed, great causes espoused. One burns for the re-introduction into life of the pursuit of greatness. And yet everywhere I go I find people sitting at the edge of their seats waiting to be shown the way. It is not therefore their fault that they stay in that posture.

The time is here, I feel, for a vast advance on many fronts. I am persuaded that there are virtually infinite possibilities, both material and moral, wherewith to vindicate freedom against unfreedom, joy of living against tyranny, man against all that is subhuman and inhuman, truth against darkness and falsehood, and God against the devil and his works. The only question is whether the realm of freedom will prove worthy of the many possibilities open to it.

This should be the specific work of the Catholic Press—to take the principles of the theologians and the power of the faith and to give them a meaning for men in our times, to make them a working part of 20th-century life in America. Contemporary involvement is our work.

The Function of the Catholic Press*

VERY REV. FRANCIS J. LALLY
Editor, The Pilot

I WONDER who first invented the idea of proposing a theme for a convention. The same person probably suggested the position of keynoter. Undoubtedly, the originator of both was some rare kind of sober personality who expected that something permanently worthwhile should come out of a convention, that the three or more days spent with other delegates of the same interests is supposed to accomplish something. There is a good deal of evidence to support the view that, despite themes and keynoters, conventions, even press conventions,

are not apt to be world-shaking events, and the people least likely to be impressed are those who attend them. We might all be better off if we just handed our texts to the NC early in the week and then seriously set out having a good time together without interruption. In this way we would doubtless get to know each other much better and, as far as I have been able to determine, this is the most lasting good effect of this or any convention.

Since we must have a theme, I suppose we may ask why this particular one was chosen. "The essen-

*The keynote address at the 49th National Convention of the Catholic Press Association, Omaha, Neb., May 13, 1959.

tial unity of the Catholic press" has a certain timeliness, of course, since this is a moment when Catholics are suddenly showing a new interest in unity of every kind. Perhaps it is intended to give us an ecumenical flavor, which will surely do us no harm at all. But, of course, there could be another meaning, quite the opposite of this. Instead of emphasizing something we have, it may be pointing to something that we have not. It may be the thought of the experts that the Catholic press is so splintered, so diverse, so nearly chaotic that we need to find some "essential" unity to pull us together again. At any rate, some one else will have to answer for the theme; for me it rests only to discover somewhere in it a tone which can in some way be called a keynote.

The unity of the Catholic press is not the same thing as our unity in the Church; it rather presupposes Church unity, the fact that we are all loyal Catholics already committed by our faith to the traditional teachings of the Church. A unity, then, of belief and practice is *not* the basis on which we can discuss the *specific* unity of the Catholic press. Every Catholic endeavor, not just the apostolate of the written word, has as a kind of antecedent postulate this unity of faith and practice; Catholic education, Catholic social action, Catholic family programs, Catholic charities and all similar efforts are one with the Catholic press in the essential unity of the Church of Christ. But what

is the *special* unity of the Catholic press which, when our common faith is accepted, gives it its appropriate and particular flavor? Taking for the moment our faith for granted, what is it that brings us all together and gives us the feeling of having something in common? The answer I would like to suggest is that our essential unity is our common purpose. It is a unity determined not so much by what we are as by what we are trying to do. This last, unfortunately, is a good deal more mysterious than we have been willing to acknowledge. It is not in fact easy to discover our purpose even from the pages of our papers. If our unity, as a press, is unclear and elusive, it is probably because our purposes, our aims, are not clearly drawn and universally subscribed to.

In general terms we have no great anxiety on this point. Long ago, we made up our minds that the Catholic press was not, in the pejorative sense of that word, merely a "pious" press. We have a task far more significant than simple edification. Perhaps it is fair to call our effort, again in the wide sense, a work of education through information. We are expected to present for our readers information not generally available elsewhere and with it an application of Christian principles to the contemporary and changing reality of history.

It can be expressed variously. To see the world in the pattern of the divine plan for man, to set against the moment the spirit of the time-

less gospel, to understand the city of man in terms of the city of God, to put the ancient principles of the Christian faith in a new guise giving them new relevance—all of this is the work of the press, the purpose for which we labor, the ideal we pursue, the goal toward which we strive. Our essential unity is this oneness of dedication, the singleness of purpose which separates us from all others who work in the world of words and which joins us together in a sacred and even divine mission.

Platitudes or Programs?

Let us suppose, then, that we can accept this much at least and acknowledge that we have agreed on the "essential unity" of the Catholic press. With all of this said, however, we are not very much brighter than we were before we began. Every Catholic paper, we suppose, looks upon itself as interpreting the world and its problems in accordance with Catholic principles. In simple truth, it is difficult to find a paper which is not full of principles, many of them, I fear, fresh from the handbooks which are given as guides to student theologians. It must be amusing for those who are not Catholic to look at our papers and to see with what ease we reach into our knapsacks and draw out rules and laws to fit every situation, however complex. They must wonder, these observers from outside the faith, if we are being serious with ourselves as we provide platitudes for a world crying out for projects and programs. If all we

needed for success was the expression of righteousness, long ago indeed would our pious and often pompous prose have led us to victory.

As we are united in purpose, so of course are we united in principle, but this is only the beginning, even where it is the foundation, of the real work we have to do. In the world of real things we must labor in that uncertain area where principles are put into practice, where the ideal in all its beauty meets the real in all its complexity. The immediate, practical decision is how in this and that concrete situation a certain rule of law finds itself operating, or how a human personality is involved in an existential state of affairs quite individual and unusual, or what to make of an event shrouded in something like mystery with dim outlines and dimmer origins—these are the matters calling for comment from Catholic editors, and the handbook is a guide which leads us only a very short distance in search of realistic answers. The essential unity of the Catholic press is a good foundation but it is intended only as a base for further building.

The immense failing of the Catholic press—and we should acknowledge this ourselves—is not that we lack unity, unity of purpose and of principle, but that we lack the kind of training that takes us very far beyond this basic unity into the practical and controversial context in which our people must live and in which they seek our assistance.

The world of principles and platitudes is a very cozy one and we have a comfortable refuge from which we can lecture in self-righteous fashion a world that distrusts the values these principles represent.

Nowhere that I know of can one find more good advice than in the pages of the Catholic press. We can tell people how to run their homes and their families, their labor unions and their laws; we give good advice on foreign aid and domestic recession; we can tell the teachers how to administer their schools and the priests how to run their parishes; there is almost no topic on which we are not prepared to present our views—economic, social, political, cultural, religious, liturgical, literary—and in every case we speak with authority but nearly always we speak in truisms. While we speak in cosmic and eternal language, our strength seems to be in analysis. With what eagerness and effect we dig our teeth into some *obiter dicta* of the Supreme Court, or some remark of a man in public life; we eagerly correct the impressions of the commentators and rewrite the articles of other journals; we have a gift for setting people straight, as if we were set up to be the watchdogs of orthodoxy and the guardians of right thinking.

We have no need really to be anxious about the essential unity of the Catholic press—we have it in abundance, such abundance indeed that it is almost literally true that when you have read one paper, you

have very nearly read them all. The somber sameness that stretches from coast to coast and from north to south, and even in some measure beyond our borders, is interpreted by some to mean that we have a "Catholic" position on all things. What it really means is that we are agreed on principles and have never got down to facts. We are, in truth, standing so far back from reality as to be almost separated from it.

Our Need: Involvement

The work of the Catholic press is actually to be involved in the present moment, not to be moralizing on theoretical and ideal cases in which no one is either interested or committed. If we could bring ourselves to the understanding that we must wrestle with concrete situations and apply our principles to real matters, we would come into collision with the spirit of the age and give shape to its future. We need an involvement to replace our detachment; we must have a contact with reality that removes the key-ring solutions of a handbook, and provides a practical guide for real people living in a real world. The fact of the matter is that we are not prepared, most of us surely, for the transfer from the world of ideas and principles to the world of facts and events.

Most of us writing in the Catholic press are trained moralizers; we are accustomed to judging things in their moral implications, and the result is that we end up by supposing that the work of the Catholic press

is only to pass moral judgment on the changing world and the acts and utterances of others. This is a grave error because we have much more to do than to judge—we must surely also prophesy and give witness, or we are not faithful to our essential Christian commitment. But to prophesy and to give witness, we must stand in the midst of the world and know its flavor, be aware of its directions, encourage its creativity and bless its advances.

It is a mistake surely for Catholic editors to think of themselves as theologians—even though they should know some theology. We are intended to be part of that world which takes the learning of the theologians and makes it work in the concrete circumstances of a changing human existence. Along with the knowledge of principles, usually our strongest point, we should have an understanding of contemporary reality in terms of its institutions, its dynamic, its social climate, its hopes, and its fears. It is not possible to provide intelligent commentary, and consequently intelligent leadership, if we are unaware of the nature of our complex society, unaware of the forces for good and evil at work in it, the direction in which it is set, the elements of power within it, and the basic issues on which men either agree or are divided.

Our theology serves us poorly indeed if we cannot bring it into contact with the present context of American life; our social philosophy is impotent unless we have a knowledge of the social sciences which

makes it relevant to this moment and to men in this moment. This should be the specific work of the Catholic press—to take the principles of the theologians and the power of the faith and to give them meaning for men in our times, to make them a working part of twentieth-century life in America. This contemporary involvement is our work, to place the leaven in the meal, and not to be satisfied until the whole be leavened.

When we suggest to our readers that their problems can be solved simply by rethinking their principles, we mislead them; when we simplify life and living in terms of moral formulae alone, we are being dishonest. Principles must be put into practice and formulae must be filled in with facts before men can find their way toward the good life. The Catholic press must bring to present realities the immense riches of the Church, of course, but it must come with practical programs and immediate answers to immediate problems.

No one must suppose that we are suggesting that principles can be set aside or are matters of no consequence. What we are saying is that they are arid and unproductive unless they are given a present reality in a context of social, economic, and cultural forces here and now existing. There are bound to be dangers in applying timeless principles to passing events—but the alternative is more dangerous: men lose confidence in the principles themselves.

If the Catholic press in America so often gets only passing respect from Catholics and less from our neighbors, it is because we lack the confidence or the ability to face real issues in a practical and committed fashion. Our essential unity is secure, but our essential task is

scarcely formulated. It is a pentecostal work to speak to men so that each generation understands in his own tongue. They may say of us "these men are full of new wine"—but it will be that divine intoxication which is the breath of the Spirit in the world making all things new.



Positive Anti-Communism

I cannot emphasize too strongly that the West must realize that it cannot fight communism successfully by negative measures, short-term plans and emergency reactions such as in Berlin, Lebanon, Jordan and Iraq. So far the West has dealt with situations piece-meal in restricted areas. The West has acted only after the East acts, been always on the defensive, and arrived too late—certainly after the Communists. The West rushes into a country because of a Communist offensive, and often has to identify itself with a person or party which does not represent or support democracy. The West thus often puts itself in the worst possible light, often does little good, if any, for democracy, and even plays into the hands of the Communists.

As I see it, the West must cease waiting until the Communists strike. The West, like the East, should try to win the world to a way of life. The West should sell international democracy, just as they try to peddle international communism. The West should not wait to fight communism in the spots the Communists pick.—*Tom Mboya, Secretary General of the Kenya Federation of Labor, in the CATHOLIC WORLD, July, 1959.*

When hypnosis is medically indicated and when it is employed by a reasonably well-trained professional, it is morally unobjectionable.

The Morality of Hypnosis*

JOSEPH T. MANGAN, S.J.
St. Mary of the Lake Seminary

Author's Introductory Note: About two years ago at the request of His Eminence, the late Samuel Cardinal Stritch, Archbishop of Chicago, we started an investigation into the subject of hypnosis with the intention of making a medico-moral evaluation. To facilitate our work we drew up a questionnaire and sent it to six leading Catholic psychiatrists: Father William J. Devlin, S.J., of Loyola University, Chicago, Ill.; Doctors Francis J. Braceland of the Institute of Living, Hartford, Conn.; Francis J. Gerty of the University of Illinois, Chicago, Ill.; John J. Madden of Loyola University, Chicago, Ill.; John I. Nurnberger of the University of Indiana, Indianapolis, Ind., and to Edward A. Strecker of the University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Penn. These men mediately or immediately directed us to send the questionnaire also to the following doctors who have been using hypnosis in their clinical practice: Doctors Milton H. Erickson, President of the American Society of Clinical Hypnosis, of Phoenix, Ariz.; Merton M. Gill of Berkeley, Cal.; William S. Kroger of Chicago, Ill.; Lawrence S. Kubie of New York, N.Y.; Harold Rosen, Executive Secretary of the Society for Clinical and Experimental Hypnosis, of Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md., and Lewis

*Reprinted from the *Linacre Quarterly*, 1438 South Grand Blvd., St. Louis 4, Mo., May, 1959.

R. Wolberg of New York, N.Y. We also sent the questionnaire to Mr. Stanley L. Morel, a hypnotist studying in Chicago, Ill.

Since all thirteen of these men answered the questionnaire in more or less detail, our debt of gratitude to them is very great. Some sent important articles and references to help in the study. In the body of the article where we quote these men without any specific reference, we are quoting from their private answers to the questionnaire.

Two other sources that we found especially helpful are the two official reports on hypnosis made by the British Medical Association, published in the *British Medical Journal*, April 23, 1955, and by the American Medical Association, published in the *Journal of the American Medical Association*, Sept. 13, 1958.

AT THE present time it is impossible to give a philosophical definition of hypnosis. Psychiatrists and other doctors who use hypnosis in their clinical practice know what effects they can produce in a patient under hypnosis. But they readily admit that they do not know precisely what is the *nature* of hypnosis.

Hypnosis derives its name from the name of the Grecian god of sleep, Hypnos. Both the procedure of inducing the artificial state of the one under hypnosis and the artificial state itself have been called by various names. The procedure has been called animal magnetism, psychological lobotomy, hypno-anesthesia, medical relaxation, suggestive relaxation, psycho-prophylactic relaxation, and the like. The artificial state itself has been called sleep, trance, hypnotic state, a kind of artificially induced sleep, a state of mental absorption, a concentration of the mind on one idea, a temporary condition of altered attention, a state of exaggerated suggestibility, and the like.

Up to relatively recent times many have thought that a state of hypnosis could not be produced by natural powers, but only by some preternatural power which they ascribed to the evil spirit. As a result, the word "hypnotism" has been used to signify spiritualistic phenomena founded in superstition or in the working of the evil spirit. But the hypnotic state is not a state induced by so-called "occult" practices, nor is it associated in nature with witchcraft, black magic, spiritualistic seances, or the like. Hypnosis is not fakery or foolishness; it is not merely a sort of game or entertainment. Rather it is a matter for serious scientific investigation. Hypnosis is not a state of sleep, as sleep is ordinarily understood. It seems to be more like the waking state than like ordinary sleep.

Today we know that the induction of an hypnotic state need not transcend the natural powers of man. Hypnosis is founded in relaxation, concentration, and suggestion. By suggestion the hypnotist induces a

relaxed subject to concentrate his attention so intensely on one object that he finally becomes aware of that object alone. Then, after the subject is in the hypnotic state, the hypnotist, if he so desires, and with the permission of the subject, widens the field of awareness even to the point where the subject is apparently completely alert to all things. Yet, according to the suggestion of the hypnotist, he is completely unaware of more or less restricted areas of sensation, for example, of sensations of pain in just one particular part of the body. In the process of induction the subject remains silent and inert. But as Drs. Kubie and Margolin observe so well:

Once he is fully hypnotized the subject need not remain silent, inert and apart. If appropriate words from the hypnotist engender corresponding purposes in the subject, he will walk around, converse intelligently, and in general make it evident that his sensori-motor horizons have re-expanded, seemingly to their pre-hypnotic limits.¹

After this brief description of what hypnosis is and what it is not, it will help to clarify our thinking during the rest of this study if we settle on a sort of working definition of hypnosis. The British and American Medical Associations provide us with just such a definition. The British Medical Association's report formulated the definition with which

the American Medical Association's report is in agreement. It reads as follows:

[Hypnosis is] a temporary condition of altered attention in the subject which may be induced by another person and in which a variety of phenomena may appear spontaneously or in response to verbal or other stimuli. These phenomena include alterations in consciousness and memory, increased susceptibility to suggestion, and the production in the subject of responses and ideas unfamiliar to him in his usual state of mind. Further, phenomena such as anesthesia, paralysis, and the rigidity of muscles, and vasomotor changes can be produced and removed in the hypnotic state.²

As we would readily conclude, the hypnotic state in the individual case can be more or less superficial or more or less deep. Some authors give as many as nine or ten different hypnotic states according to the depth of the state. Others, restricting the number, include the nine or ten within their own number of four or five. Ordinary distinctions are made between what are called "waking suggestion," "waking hypnosis," "superficial state," "somnambulistic state," and the "coma or trance state." Also, depending on how widely he interprets and applies the term, hypnosis, one doctor will find a state of hypnosis where another will deny its presence. One doctor will maintain, for example,

¹ Lawrence S. Kubie, M.D., and Sydney Margolin, M.D., "The Process of Hypnotism and the Nature of the Hypnotic State," *The American Journal of Psychiatry*, Vol. 100, No. 5, March, 1944 (pp. 611-622), p. 618.

² *British Medical Journal*, April 23, 1955.

that the method of so-called "natural childbirth" is not a type of hypnosis, whereas another doctor regularly using hypnosis and practicing in the field of obstetrics and gynecology maintains that it is.

There is also wide variation in the techniques of inducing the hypnotic state. Seemingly there is little superiority of one method over another, when each is competently applied. If the hypnotist is confident in his technique, if he is sufficiently persuasive and persistent, and if he knows how to shift his technique in accordance with the changing reactions of his subject, he will probably be rewarded with a maximum of induction successes. All literature on the subject agrees that it is easy to learn how to hypnotize.

Judgments among hypnotists still differ markedly on two points that most intimately touch the field of morals. Some maintain that those in an hypnotic state will refuse to execute commands which in their usual state of mind they would not do because of moral objections. Others judge that they can induce a person under hypnosis to act contrary to the dictates of his conscience. To these latter the extent to which the hypnotized person will follow the suggestions of the hypnotist seems to depend on the depth of the hypnotic state. There is also definite disagreement about whether it is possible by suggestion to in-

duce an hypnotic state in an unwilling subject.

Another type of hypnosis coming to the fore today is self-hypnosis or auto-hypnosis. This is not the same as auto-suggestion. In auto-suggestion there is no relation, real or fancied, with any other person. In self-hypnosis there is implied a relation between two individuals: the subject and his hypnotist. Certain physicians will hypnotize a particular patient and instill in him a post-hypnotic suggestion that the patient can by performing certain actions hypnotize himself when he wishes.*

From what has been said so far, it is apparent that although hypnosis is being used today as a medical procedure, a great deal of work must yet be done to explore more thoroughly its nature, and to determine more accurately its long-range effects as well as criteria for the selection of patients.

Medical Uses of Hypnosis

In general, hypnosis today is a recognized aid to medical and psychiatric practice, as an adjunct to other therapeutic techniques. In confirmation of this statement we need only inspect the hospital records which tell of its success in actual use. Courses in medical hypnosis have been offered in some, even though in only a very few, accredited medical schools, for ex-

* Harold Rosen, Ph.D., M.D., "Hypnosis, Mental Hygiene, and the Dentist-Hypnotist," *Journal of Clinical and Experimental Hypnosis*, Vol. V, No. 3, July, 1957 (pp. 161-181), esp. pp. 121-125.

ample, in Seton Hall College of Medicine and Dentistry, the Catholic medical school in Newark, New Jersey. Both the American and the British Medical Associations recommend in their reports that courses be established under proper auspices for the training of doctors in the proper medical uses of hypnosis. And they both encourage active participation in high level research by members of the medical and dental professions.

"[Hypnosis]," according to the report of the British Medical Association, "has been of great importance to the growth of modern psychotherapy." The subcommittee which helped draw up the published report was satisfied that

... hypnosis is of value and may be the treatment of choice in some cases of so-called psychosomatic disorder and psychoneurosis. It may also be of value for revealing unrecognized motives and conflicts in such conditions. As a method of treatment it has proved its ability to remove symptoms and to alter morbid habits of thought and behavior.⁴

In the long-term rebuilding of a patient's personality, however, most doctors agree that its best practical use lies in effecting a proper rapport between the patient and the doctor.

Its other medical uses are as an analgesic or anesthetic agent. Acute pain (such as is found, for example, in migraine headaches), chronic

pain (such as is found in terminal cases of cancer), and post-operative pain, all have been alleviated by hypnosis. In addition, there is the obvious advantage that in these cases habit-forming drugs are altogether unnecessary or needed in only modified amounts.

As an anesthetic during surgery hypnosis has been used by itself, that is, without any drugs, and as an adjunct to the use of drugs. By itself, hypnosis has been used frequently enough in dentistry, in painful diagnostic examinations, and in minor surgery (such as tonsilectomy and plastic surgery). When it is used in major surgery, it is usually used as a valuable adjunct to the use of drugs. In such surgery it can help better the patient's outlook, ease his tensions before the operation, and minimize post-operative shock. The quantity of drugs needed is reduced, if not entirely eliminated. Furthermore, in exceptional cases of major surgery when unfavorable reactions to chemical anesthetics have rendered their use practically impossible, hypnosis has been used successfully by itself. Dr. Joseph Tobin, who uses hypnosis as an anesthetic in his work at Alexian Brothers Hospital, Chicago, Illinois, has used it in doing hernia operations and appendectomies, in setting bones, taking care of rectal abscesses and various lacerations, in doing kidney examinations and other work on the male genital tract.

⁴ *British Medical Journal*, April 23, 1955.

In the field of obstetrics, the judgment that in selected cases there is no danger of ill effects to the mother or child is gaining more widespread approval. The doctors who defend the use of hypnosis as an anesthetic in delivery rooms stress the fact that through its use there is assured a marked decrease in the dangers of fetal anoxia. Evidence from various sources agrees that mothers who delivered under hypnosis gave birth to remarkably pink babies, who cried unusually soon after delivery, and that the mothers considered their experience a remarkably pleasant one. But the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists does not favor the use of hypnosis as a means of relieving the pains of parturition. In the "Report of the Committee on Obstetrical Anesthesia and Analgesia" which was presented to and approved by the Executive Board of the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists at its meeting in April, 1958, in Los Angeles, California, it is stated:

We would welcome a really scientific evaluation of the use of hypnosis in obstetrical practice considered from the obstetrician's and the anesthesiologist's standpoints as well as from the patient's point of view. It must be emphasized that as yet we do not know of evidence to suggest that any large segment of the population, without recourse to anesthetic agents in an effort to relieve pain, can undergo the experiences of labor and delivery in a manner satis-

factory to themselves, and at the same time accomplish delivery with preservation of as great a measure of maternal health and with as little effect on fetal life as is commonly realized by the usual conduct of labor . . .

We must keep in mind the fact that zealous emphasis of the merits of any single method of conducting labor and delivery may lead to the neglect of skills that are life-saving when the not too infrequent abnormalities and emergencies arise. We would emphasize that a real danger exists in the development of an enthusiastic faith in the spontaneity and naturalness of parturition, if this state of mind results in the deterioration of the facilities and personnel necessary to accomplish operative delivery promptly and efficiently. When operative delivery is indicated, the almost perfect safety that a highly developed anesthesia-operating team is most likely to assure is an asset that mothers cannot afford losing.

At this time this Committee neither recommends nor condemns the employment of hypnosis as a means of relieving the pains of parturition. We believe, however, that the dangers and advantages inherent in the employment of both general and regional anesthesia are better known and more widely appreciated. It is evident that the majority of obstetricians and anesthesiologists are not able to recognize those individuals with a psychotic tendency for whom hypnosis might have most undesirable consequences. Adaption of this procedure to the needs of any considerable proportion of women during labor and delivery should be the responsibility of, and accomplished at the direction of competently trained psychiatrists.⁵

⁵ Quoted from a private hectographed copy of the Report.

The doctors whom we consulted were not very explicit in suggesting criteria for the selection of patients on whom hypnosis could be safely used. Most of them agreed that if hypnosis was contemplated for purposes of anesthesia alone, then the patient should be emotionally stable, that is, that there should be no clinical evidence of mental disorder. One doctor suggested that a dentist before using hypnosis as an anesthetic should routinely ask his patient whether he is under psychiatric treatment. Another doctor, Milton H. Erickson, M.D., stated that the only criterion needed is a positive answer to the question whether the patient is willing and can be hypnotized.

It is also noteworthy that, according to an estimate made by Drs. Sol T. DeLee and William S. Kroger, only about 10% of carefully selected patients can be hypnotized sufficiently to allow major surgery without the aid of drugs.

Dr. Lewis Wolberg in his study, "Current Practices in Hypnotherapy," gives the following excellent summary of the medical uses of hypnosis:

Employed by a reasonably trained professional, within the context of a structured therapeutic program, with proper awareness of limits of its application and with appropriate timing, hypnosis can make a contribution as an adjunct

to any of the manifold branches of psychotherapy whether these be directive, non-directive, supportive, re-educative, or psycho-analytic. Hypnosis also has value as a reassuring and analgesic agent, both as a means of composing apprehensive patients and as a mode of lessening pain. It has been used with effectiveness as a preliminary measure in electric shock therapy, obstetrics, minor surgery, plastic surgery, dentistry, and diagnostic examinations such as bronchoscopy and sigmoidoscopy. The dangers inherent in its use are few or non-existent, if it is skillfully employed by a responsible operator.*

Dangers

That there are dangers from the use of hypnosis cannot be denied. The British Medical Association in their report summed up the matter this way:

The dangers of hypnotism have been exaggerated in some quarters. The subcommittee is convinced, however, that they do exist, especially when it is used without proper consideration on persons predisposed, constitutionally or by the effects of disease, to severe psychoneurotic reactions or anti-social behavior. The commission of crimes involving even danger to life is not entirely to be ruled out.[†]

Such predisposed persons are judged by some doctors to be those who have latent, that is, partially or fully concealed, paranoid tendencies. But many doctors believe that paranoid patients would resist hypnosis.

* "Current Practices in Hypnotherapy," *Progress in Psychotherapy*, 1956, Grune & Stratton, Inc., (pp. 217-233), p. 230.

[†] *British Medical Journal*, April 23, 1955.

William J. Devlin, S.J., M.D., says that it is "very questionable whether hypnosis should be used in the case of a schizophrenic personality. I did not say schizophrenic psychosis." Dr. John I. Nurnberger adds that "the primary danger for a psychiatric patient is the coercive achievement of a seemingly desired goal for which the patient is not otherwise prepared." Another doctor, who wishes to remain anonymous, mentions this danger that "in precarious adjustments more obvious states of psychiatric disorder may be precipitated."

Other dangers that might be listed are: undue attachment to the hypnotist, failure of the hypnotist to cancel suggestions not specifically meant for retention which could have unintended adverse post-hypnotic effects, removal of symptoms without discovery of the cause, masking of possible symptoms, fears of the patient due to lack of knowledge of what happened under hypnosis and consequent distrust of the doctor.

Dr. Harold Rosen of the Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine cautions against the use of self-hypnosis. "There is little," he says, "in the whole field of psychodynamics with so great a potential for harm." By way of explanation he continues:

The desire for self-hypnosis, whatever the rationalization advanced by its

practitioner, when investigated frequently turns out to be a desire to further fantasy formation, to facilitate sinking deeper and deeper into a dream world of one's own. . . . Some dentists and obstetricians are now suggesting to their hypnotized patients that, whenever they have headaches, they can hypnotize themselves and thereby be rid of them. We have seen three such dental patients. Self-hypnosis for them had dangerous sequela. With a fourth, however, it may or may not have constituted a problem. But with every dentist and with every physician who himself practiced self-hypnosis and whom we ultimately examined psychiatrically—there have been some 10 or 12 patients in this category—it was exceedingly dangerous. All were compounding trouble for themselves.*

Sometimes, too, recordings are used to hypnotize others. This is dangerous because there is no one present to observe reactions. If a doctor were present and saw unfavorable reactions, he could stop the hypnotic process. For instance, a woman physician was among a group listening to recordings designed to hypnotize them. As a result, she was almost in a panic some twelve hours later and requested emergency psychiatric help.*

Before we conclude this treatment of dangers, we should say something about the dangers of hypnosis used specifically for entertainment purposes. While there are exceptions, in almost all cases the high pressure and speed required in stage

* Harold Rosen, Ph.D., M.D., loc.cit., pp. 121,122.

* Harold Rosen, Ph.D., M.D., loc.cit., p. 124.

work leaves much to chance. The entertainer-hypnotist does not know the person he is hypnotizing. He has not had previous conferences and background material, so that he would know what not to ask the person to do. Even if he had such information, he is not trained in psychological behavior; he does not know enough about human emotions and about the emotional bases of human behavior to avoid all danger. The result is that he could run into psychological reactions with which he is not prepared to cope. The person hypnotized can have severe emotional upsets due to the embarrassment he experiences after hypnosis. To see others laughing at him and to be unaware of what really happened can have a permanent effect upon the subject. One doctor reports that he saw such cases. If the hypnotist actually induces an hypnotic state before an audience, there is some danger that some members of the audience also will be hypnotized. This is dangerous because the hypnotist might not even think of the need to bring them out of their hypnotic state.

Moral Evaluation

In the nineteenth century, from 1840 to 1899, various authoritative directives were given by Catholic ecclesiastical authorities in Rome. Two answers each were given by

the Holy Office and by the Sacred Congregation of the Inquisition, and a circular letter was sent by the latter Congregation to all bishops. These directives condemned the abuse but not the legitimate use of hypnosis. To illustrate what was contained substantially in all the directives, we cite in detail the following question and answer:

Should magnetism, considered in general and in itself, be judged lawful or not?

On June 23, 1840, the Holy Office replied:

Where all error, divination, and explicit and implicit calling on the devil is absent, the mere act of employing physical means otherwise lawful is not forbidden, provided they do not tend to any unlawful or sinful purpose. But the application of principles and merely physical means to explain physically things and effects which are really supernatural is nothing but unlawful and heretical deception.¹⁰

Within the past few years Pope Pius XII made two statements about hypnosis, the first in his address to an audience for gynecologists, January 8, 1956, the second to members of a symposium on anesthesiology, February 24, 1957. In these statements the Pope showed, as Father Kelly observes,¹¹ "that he considered this as primarily a medical question

¹⁰ Quoted by Antonius Ballerini, S.J.—Dominicus Palmieri, S.J., *Opus Theologicum Morale in Busembaum Medullam*, Prati, 1889-1892, Vol. II, n. 366.

¹¹ Gerald Kelly, S.J., *Medico-Moral Problems*, The Catholic Hospital Association of the United States and Canada, St. Louis, Mo., 1958, Chapter 32, "Hypnosis as Anesthesia," p. 289.

and that the judgment of its morality would ultimately be based on sound medical opinion." Here is the pertinent part of the second address:

But consciousness can also be reduced by artificial means. It makes no difference from the moral standpoint whether this result is obtained by the administration of drugs or by hypnosis, which can be called a psychic analgesic. But hypnosis, even considered exclusively in itself, is subject to certain rules. . . . In the matter which engages Us at present, there is question of hypnosis practiced by the doctor to serve a clinical purpose, while he observes the precautions which science and medical ethics demand from the doctor as much as from the patient who submits to it. The moral judgment which We are going to state on the suppression of consciousness applies to this specific use of hypnosis. But We do not wish what We say of hypnosis in the service of medicine to be extended to hypnosis in general without qualification. In fact, hypnosis, insofar as it is an object of scientific research, cannot be studied by any casual individual, but only by a serious scientist, and within the moral limits valid for all scientific activity. It is not the affair of some group of laymen or ecclesiastics, who might dabble in it as an interesting activity for the sake of mere experience . . .¹²

The papal statements seem reducible to the following succinct principle: When hypnosis is medically indicated, it is morally unobjectionable, that is, if employed by a reasonably trained professional.

In making our final conclusion about the morality of the use of hypnosis we should consider five requirements:

1) The doctor practicing hypnosis must be a competent and conscientious practitioner. Since at the present time there is no professionally recognized set of standards for judging the competence of the hypnotist, hospitals have had to set up their own standards. Schools and groups which conduct courses in the nature of hypnosis and in the techniques of induction grant what amounts to a certificate of attendance but commonly grant no certificate of competence.¹³ In one hospital the staff members sit in judgment on the competence of the doctor wishing to use hypnosis, in another the head of the individual department (for example, of the obstetric department) judges that the doctor may or may not use hypnosis. In making this judgment there is special need to make sure that the hypnotist is a doctor of high professional integrity, of balanced judgment, and of good moral character. Where prudence demands, there should be at least a third person present to protect the interests both of the patient and of the doctor, especially when the patient is a woman. Pertinent to this first requirement are the words of the report made by the American Medi-

¹² Translation from the *Catholic Mind* (May-June, 1957), pp. 271, 272.

¹³ An exception to this general statement is found in the training program of The American Society of Psychoosomatic Dentistry and Medicine which leads to a certificate of competence, according to a mimeographed copy of the Society's constitution and by-laws issued in 1958.

cal Association, in introduction of which Richard J. Plunkett, M.D., secretary, asserts:

Preliminary investigation by the council revealed that centers for training, under proper auspices, were sharply lacking. It was also noted that many courses in hypnosis were being offered to physicians and dentists by groups who, in the council's opinion, were not properly accredited by any professional school or university. Likewise, courses were being offered to physicians and dentists on the basis of a 5-lesson or 10-lesson course in hypnosis, offered solely as correspondence courses. . . . In substance, the council's report indicates that there are definite and proper uses of hypnosis in medical and dental practice *in the hands of those who are properly trained.*

The report itself adds:

It has already been emphasized in this report that a background of psychodynamic psychology and psychiatry is essential in order to understand the phenomena of hypnosis. It is equally important to insist on the fact that the utilization of hypnotic techniques for therapeutic purposes should be restricted to those *individuals who are qualified by background and training* to fulfill all the necessary criteria that are required for a complete diagnosis of the illness which is to be treated. Hypnosis should be *used on a highly selective basis* by such individuals and should never become a single technique used under all circumstances by a therapist. No physician or dentist should utilize hypnosis for purposes that are not related to his particular specialty and that are *beyond the range of his ordinary*

competence. . . . General practitioners, medical specialists, and dentists might find hypnosis valuable as a therapeutic adjunct within the specific field of their professional competence. . . . Teaching related to hypnosis should be under responsible medical or dental direction, and integrated teaching programs should include not only the techniques of induction but also the indications and limitations for its use within the specific area involved. Instruction limited to induction techniques alone should be discouraged. Certain aspects of hypnosis still remain unknown and controversial, as is true in many other areas of medicine and the psychological sciences. Therefore, active participation in high-level research by members of the medical and dental professions is to be encouraged.¹⁴

N.B. Emphases in above added by author.

2) A proportionate cause is required, because we are not permitted without a compensating reason to give up our dominion over the rational faculties of understanding and will. When, however, a competent and conscientious physician concludes that hypnosis is medically indicated, we may accept his assurance that it is for the benefit and general health of his patient. But entertainment value is not justification for the use of hypnosis, any more than it would be for drunkenness or any other temporary deprivation of the use of reason. For this reason and because of the dangers involved we agree with the condemnation in the American Medical As-

¹⁴ Journal of the American Medical Association, Sept. 13, 1958, pp. 186-189.

sociation's report that "the use of hypnosis for entertainment purposes is vigorously condemned." Our judgment is that it is objectively sinful to use hypnosis just for purposes of entertainment. The matter itself is serious, although it does admit of parvity of matter. In an individual case the sin could be venial.

3) The consent of the patient must be procured, because no one has the right to deprive another against his wishes of the full use

of his faculties. It is not necessary, however, always to obtain the explicit consent of the patient.

4) "There should be no unjustifiable risk of harm for the patient."¹⁸ This requirement is always necessary for the lawful use of drugs, surgery, or other medical procedure.

5) And finally, "professional secrecy must be rigidly observed concerning the information gleaned in the course of the treatment" under hypnosis.¹⁹



Intra-racial Action

The problem of migrants—from the United States or from abroad—will be with us for a long, long time. Where the newcomers bring with them the habits and concepts of a different culture, as in the case of the Puerto Ricans, their arrival brings problems of cultural integration, quite as much as racial. Certainly we wish, we rightly require, that they understand and learn our own way of doing things, our major likes and dislikes. But if this effort on their part is to be sincere and effective, it implies a corresponding attempt on our part to understand their culture as well: in some ways a more ancient culture than our own. The same applies to the other migrant groups in our midst: to Mexicans, for instance, and particularly to the American Indians. To repeat an expression which we have often used in the past: there is need for *intra-racial* action as a complement of *interracial* action. And intra-racial action, to be successful, must start within the group itself.—John LaFarge, S.J., in the *INTERRACIAL REVIEW*, June, 1959.

¹⁸ Requirements 4) and 5) are taken from Father Gerald Kelly's book, *Medico-Moral Problems*, quoted above, Chapter 31, "Narcoanalysis and Hypnoanalysis," pp. 284, 285.

Its greatest contribution will be realized in the use which American scholars will make of this splendid collection of nearly a million original manuscripts.

The Vatican Manuscript Library in America*

DANIEL D. MCGARRY

THE American Historical Association in its annual convention of 1956 called attention to one of the most important scholarly projects ever undertaken by American Catholics, the joint Saint Louis University-Knights of Columbus microfilming of the entire Vatican Manuscript Library. This enormous task, which at one stroke both helps insure the precious Vatican collection from the threat of loss and makes it available to American scholars, has now been completed.

The idea grew in the search for an answer to a routine academic

problem. In 1949 Saint Louis University had strengthened its program in Medieval History, and the department was looking for ways to add a good manuscript collection to the University Library. Father Lowrie Daly, S.J., of the History Department had just returned from studies at the University of Toronto, where he had worked with microfilm copies of medieval manuscripts. He suggested that the University Library film the Vatican Manuscript Library, the richest of its kind in existence.

The idea was daring. There were diplomatic, financial, and technical

*Reprinted from the *Priest*, Our Sunday Visitor Inc., Huntington, Ind., January, 1959.

problems in connection with such an ambitious project, but in 1950 the University authorities began the necessary negotiations. These were successful, and on Christmas Eve, 1950, Saint Louis University received papal permission to microfilm the collection and was designated the sole depository of these treasures in the Western hemisphere. The film library, like the original Vatican Library, was to be open to all interested scholars.

But numerous hurdles had yet to be surmounted. Among these was the procuring of financial assistance. Various large American learned foundations were approached by representatives of the University, but funds were not immediately forthcoming. At this point, in July, 1951, the Knights of Columbus offered to support the project. Cooperating with the University, they set up and financed a foundation for the Preservation of Historical Documents in the Vatican Library. The Knights of Columbus would not only underwrite the microfilming, but would also cooperate in establishing a permanent depository for the collection at the University. The latter was to be provided with a full-time librarian and the necessary physical equipment to make the collection available to scholars.

The Microfilming

Meanwhile Father Daly and Father Joseph Donnelly, S.J., then the University Librarian, traveled to Vatican City. Father Daly remained in Rome to supervise the operation,

while Father Donnelly returned to the United States to expedite the shipment of the most modern equipment. Unexpected difficulty was encountered in the securing of a large developing unit which was manufactured by only one company, whose entire output had been pre-empted by the U.S. Government during the Korean War. But at length a release order was secured and the huge machine was air-freighted to Vatican City.

The microfilming had to be organized so as to secure the maximum of efficiency and the best possible results, for "there are microfilms, and there are microfilms." Invaluable technical assistance was provided by Mr. E. T. Freel, then of Remington Rand, and Mr. M. E. Brand, of Graphic Microfilm. By the close of 1955 the project had fifteen technicians, operating eight cameras and two developers, whose average output of film was about 12,000 feet per week. A foot of microfilm averages about thirteen manuscript pages.

The microfilming was completed in June of 1957. The original negative is stored in an especially conditioned vault in the United States. One positive film is kept at the Vatican itself, while a second is placed on file in the Vatican Microfilm Depository at St. Louis University. There are now at the depository over eleven million filmed manuscript pages available for consultation.

The assembling of a Papal library in Rome began in the earliest days

of the Church. It has survived the shock of barbarian and Muslim invasions, and the trials of the Avignon residence of the Popes and the Great Western Schism, but the library has grown most steadily since the fifteenth century.

The Vatican Manuscript Library consists of thousands of hand-written works bound together in some 50,000 to 60,000 volumes, called "codices." Sometimes a codex includes about twenty works, ranging from extensive treatises and histories to short works, poems, letters, and other documents. Some codices contain several hundred separate letters, for example. The binding into volumes is largely for stacking and preserving, but works on similar topics, e.g., philosophy, theology, medicine, law, literature, etc., are generally grouped together and arranged in chronological sequence.

There is, of course, a certain amount of duplication in such a vast manuscript library. Accordingly, not all the materials were microfilmed. But all manuscript codices that experts believe may be of present or future use to scholars were filmed in the Latin, Greek and modern language groups of codices in the Vatican Manuscript Library. The filming included a photostatic reproduction of the more than 250,000 cards which make up a partial catalogue of the manuscript department.

In 1956 the University also received permission to film the rare editions in the Vatican Printed Book Library. It is planned to reproduce and distribute, at cost, filmed copies

of any printed books in the collection for which there may be some general demand among American scholars. Various professors, libraries, and institutions of higher learning in the country have been contacted for recommendations in this connection.

Any attempt to survey the possibilities for research in a collection of such magnitude, even in general terms, defies adequacy, and must remain a "bird's-eye view," in more senses than one. Nevertheless, some fertile fields for scholarship in the collection may be mentioned by way of suggestion.

The Contents

The selective contents of the Vatican Manuscript Library comprise thousands upon thousands of separate works and items. These include histories, biographies, chronicles, annals, letters, reports, documents of various types, treatises on all sorts of subjects, literature of many descriptions, commentaries, notes, translations, etc. Manuscripts range in age from the fifth to the nineteenth centuries, although many are copies of earlier works.

From the point of view of general history, the Vatican Manuscript Library constitutes a cumulative monument of original materials ranging from ancient times to the present. For ancient history, the collection is rich in works from Greek and Roman classical antiquity, such as the historical and literary writings of the more noted classical authors,

along with those of many of their lesser contemporaries. For early Church history, the collection is strong in source materials for the history of primitive Christianity, such as ancient Bibles, martyrologies, lives of the saints, liturgical works, and Papal records. Included are the writings of the great Church Fathers, both eastern and western, as well as those of many lesser lights of the early Church. Much valuable material for the history of early doctrinal controversies and the evolution of Christian dogma is present.

Medieval History

For medieval history, the collection is equally virtually unexplored. The early Middle Ages are represented by works and writings from all parts of Europe. The like holds still truer, in still greater quantity and much improved quality, of the High Middle Ages when Christian society in Western Europe was making giant strides in almost every field. The progress of the High Middle Ages is related and reflected in numerous historical productions, philosophical and theological compositions, political and legal works, scientific and mathematical treatises, translations and compendia, ecclesiastical and diplomatic records, and examples of art and music, to mention only more outstanding categories.

The Vatican Manuscript Library is justly famous for its rich holdings of Renaissance materials from the fourteenth to the sixteenth centuries. For the latter it constitutes, in fact,

one of the world's most famous source-collections. The humanistic interests and activities of the so-called "Renaissance Popes," such as Nicholas V and Pius II, are reflected. Both Italian and Transalpine works of the period are well represented.

Nor does the Vatican collection stop here, as is sometimes erroneously imagined. Correspondence and controversial literature "from both sides of the fence" are abundant for the Reformation Era. Samples include letters of Luther and Melancthon, dispatches of Cardinal Cajetan, letters of Henry VIII, and writings of Cardinal Pole. Abundant materials from the 17th and 18th centuries are present, including extensive histories, chronicles, and documents concerning developments from the destructive Thirty Years War at the outset of the period, to the epochal French Revolution at its close.

Among examples are the letter-files of Duke Maximilian of Bavaria, 1600-1640; the correspondence of French and Polish Kings, and the diaries of Popes, papal secretaries and cardinals, as well as other leaders, lay and secular. Many similar unpublished sources from the 19th century are available. Among the latter are the papers and notes of great scholars, such as the famous paleographer, Cardinal Mai, and the noted archeologist, De Rossi. Thus historians will find valuable and rewarding original materials for almost every period of European history in the Vatican Manuscript Library.

For the history of philosophy,

theology, and the Church, the Vatican Library is probably the richest manuscript collection in the world. In addition to early handwritten copies of the works of the ancient philosophers, such as Aristotle, Plato, the Stoics, the Academicians, and the Neo-Platonists, the Library contains a vast amount of unpublished Medieval and Renaissance philosophical source materials from the tenth to the sixteenth centuries, as well as later dates.

The Sciences and Mathematics

Materials for the history of the sciences and mathematics are also abundant. Works on physical and biological sciences range from those of noted "ancients," such as Aristotle and Heraclitus, to those of "moderns," such as Copernicus, Kepler, and Galileo. Included are many medieval scientific translations and treatises by authors such as Gerard of Cremona, Albertus Magnus, Roger Bacon, and Theodoric of Freiburg. Mathematical works have a similar spread from those of Euclid and Archimedes to those of Heytesbury. Cardano, Beldomandi, and Pacioli.

The collection is also excellent for the history of medicine. It is well stocked with medical treatises, translations, and commentaries, ranging from ancient Greek, such as Hippocrates and Galen, through Muslims, such as Rhazes and Avicenna, to Medieval and Renaissance physicians such as Constantine the African, Thaddeus of Florence, and Guy de Chauliac.

Various types of engineering, mechanical, hydraulic, civil, and military, are represented by diagrams and plans for hoists and pulleys, drainage, river and flood control, roads and towns, war-machines and siege-devices. Data on seismology exemplify a minor field of science. Numerous interesting geographical treatises and travel-books are included.

The building up of the Vatican Library on a large scale began in the "age of humanism," and much of it still reflects the interests of that day. The Library is perhaps best known for its wonderful collection of ancient Greek and Latin classics, and the scholarly works of Renaissance humanists, Transalpine as well as Italian, such as Petrarch, Salutati, Lorenzo Valla, and a host of others. For the modern humanist the collection represents a paradisiacal pasture.

Various European vernacular languages and literatures are represented in successive stages of their development. This is especially true of Romance languages and literatures, such as Italian, Spanish and French. But many German, English, and other European, as well as Oriental works and writings are also present. The interests of the Popes and their scholarly advisors did not stop at any given boundary-lines.

Since many of the foregoing works were written and preserved in connection with schools and scholarly pursuits, they reflect the history of education and learning. There are also to be found in the Vatican col-

lection numerous pedagogical treatises, text-books, and notes, valuable for the history of instruction.

The Arts and Music

The manuscript codices of the Vatican Library, particularly those of a religious nature, such as Bibles and breviaries, are replete with excellent examples of Medieval and Renaissance illumination, illustration, and calligraphy. While on a smaller scale than the larger wall and canvas paintings of the better known Renaissance artists, these often superb miniatures are important in the history of art. Steps are being taken by Saint Louis University to duplicate sets of colored transparencies of certain illuminated manuscripts, so that teachers and professors may have them available for use in classes.

The collection also contains numerous sketches, portraits, caricatures, and cartoons. Several designs for sculptural works in the collection are significant for the history of this art.

Any survey of this sort must needs be sketchy and elemental. There is no man alive who is familiar with the full contents of the Vatican Manuscript Library. Almost unlimited opportunities await scholars in-

terested in original research, but broadly speaking, research possibilities in the collection may be divided into three main categories: 1) the edition and translation of important manuscripts as yet unpublished; 2) the correction (by emendations, additions, subtractions, and, where needed, new critical editions) of texts already published; 3) new scholarly studies and researches based in whole or in part on materials in the Library. Opportunities in the latter field are boundless.

The Saint Louis University project for the microfilming of the Vatican Manuscript Library has been conducted from the mist of ideas into the realm of reality. In the process the original concept has been greatly expanded with Knights of Columbus support. From being originally a means to implement a local curriculum in medieval history, the project has become another milestone in the ever advancing history of American scholarship. It exemplifies the great possibilities of microfilming. It has given birth and impetus to several offshoots. But its greatest contribution will be realized in the use which American scholars will make of this splendid collection of nearly a million original manuscripts.

During almost two years of Communist rule in India's Kerala State, the Reds have progressively undermined democratic institutions and aroused the opposition of almost the entire citizenry.

The Kerala Story*

T. VADASSERY

WHEN the Communists assumed power in Kerala on April 5th, 1957, even their worst critics did not imagine that within a few months' time a reign of terror would be let loose there. Even when stories of corruption and nepotism were reported, many honest men, both in and outside Kerala, thought these were mere unfounded allegations invented to discredit the party in power. They thought that the Communists should be given a fair chance to show their worth. But what has happened in Kerala for the past few months is really an eye-opener to everybody.

Kerala, the smallest of India's States, is less than one half of Belgium in size. It lies on the south-western tip of the Indian subcontinent and has a population of 13.6 million.

Scenically Kerala is the delight of the tourists. It possesses innumerable rivers and countless meandering canals with quaint looking canoes, miles on miles of cool coconut groves, plantations of rubber, coffee and tea. The blue mountains in the east with their immense forests rich in wild life, and the vast expanse of ocean in the west make Kerala a dreamland.

*Reprinted from *Expulsus*, Catholic Newsletter on Expellee Affairs, Königstein, West Germany, Vol. VII, No. 1/3.

Kerala with its immense natural wealth and unlimited possibilities is the poorest State in India. The present annual per capita income in Kerala is Rs. 240, while in the rest of India it is Rs. 294. Of this 60% is spent on food, 10% on clothing, and the rest on the numerous necessities of life.

That a Communist government was voted into power two years ago does not mean that the majority of the population of Kerala is Communist. Many factors helped the Reds to power: the corruption and favoritism prevailing in the previous governments, and their inability to solve a chronic unemployment problem, the disunity among the various non-Communist parties, communal rivalry, the clever propaganda and the liberal promises of the Communists which won the sympathy and support of the poor who expected much from a "workers' government. These are just a few of the factors which the Communists cleverly exploited to gain 34.68 per cent of the total votes polled. Yet the present electoral system secured for them 60 seats in the 120 seat legislature. The remaining 65% of the votes was divided among the various democratic parties and the independent candidates. Thus the 34.68 per cent of the votes and the support of 5 independent candidates enabled them to form the first elected Government in the history of communism. This was a surprise of which even the members of the Communist party did not dream in their wildest imaginings.

The Promise

The Communists have been ruling Kerala 18 months now. In their election manifesto they had elaborated a very attractive program of legislation, such as increase in wages, land distribution, anti-eviction laws, etc., with the immediate object of winning the good will of the man in the street. They had promised that they would solve the food and unemployment problems, nationalize the plantations, start new industries and take over road and water transportation.

But, to date, the Communist government has not implemented any of these promises. It has not started any project to hasten the economic development of the State for the benefit of the people. Instead, the government seems to have laid more emphasis on the spreading of Communist doctrine and planting party men or their sympathizers in key positions of the administration. They utilize their position to advance the cause of the party and its supporters in different sections of social life.

As a result the government has completely failed to solve the unemployment problem. Employment opportunities are actually decreasing. Not only has the government not been able to set up even a single new industrial unit, during the past 18 months, but several industrial programs many entrepreneurs had planned to establish in Kerala have been canceled on account of the unstable situation prevailing in the State. To make matters worse,

a number of factories which were already functioning have declared a lockout following labor troubles.

When the Reds came to power in Kerala 18 months ago, it was obvious that they would endeavor to make the State a showpiece of communism in India. And in fact, it did seem for some time that they would surprise the world with their moderation and their ability to provide the State with at least a semblance of democracy. But this hope was short-lived.

The Reality

The Communists suddenly reversed themselves and began to pursue a policy of thorough and systematic intimidation. The opposition parties were dubbed enemies of the people and the State. A government ordinance forbade the police to interfere in any trouble where labor was involved. The Communists tried to exert their power especially in rural areas by means of intimidation and cell courts. In consequence crimes and labor unrest are present everywhere. Arson, hold-ups and looting are frequent. Factory or estate managers have been seized and kept as hostages by unruly laborers. There are well-attested examples of Communists threatening magistrates and of police parties being detained while on duty by groups of men led by Communist members of the State legislature. Judges and other officers who in pursuance of their duty condemned Communists have found themselves either demoted or transferred.

The cause of the maladministration of Kerala is the Communist practice of party interference in administration. Photostat copies of writs and summonses issued by the cell courts have been published by the dailies in Kerala. The Law Minister himself has admitted that specific instances of cell-court abuse have been brought to the notice of the government. Meanwhile the police, abused in performing even their normal duties of maintaining law and order, have become ineffective, so much so that even when they are present at trouble spots, they fear to take action against theft, assault or even more serious offenses. When complaints are registered against Communists, the government interferes and orders their withdrawal. If, on the contrary, a Communist brings charges the police take quick action. Several false cases have been filed against prominent and innocent people for no other reason except that they are against communism.

These abuses are more manifest where trade unions are concerned. The Communists who are the self-appointed protectors of the working classes do not hesitate to come down heavily on the side of management in labor troubles whenever the union concerned is a non-Communist one. In a few cases they have not hesitated to murder the non-Communist trade-union agitators. During the past 18 months more than 300 murders of political or labor agitators have been reported in the press.

The Opposition

Twice, however, during the Communist experiment in Kerala, the Communists found that they have had to bow to the forces of democracy. The first was occasioned by the famous Kerala education bill. The bill was intended to assure control of the youth of the State and their indoctrination in Communist ideology. It was also meant to harass the Christians who run most of the educational institutions in Kerala.

The Christian community reacted sharply. Soon all anti-Communist forces and the greater part of the population joined in the fight. But, in spite of State-wide protests, demonstrations and representations, the bill was carried through the Communist-dominated legislature.

The whole procedure was a mockery of the democratic parliamentary system. The total time allotted to the discussion of the bill at its various stages was 13 hours, in spite of the fact that public opinion against it had been expressed on a scale unprecedented in the history of any legislature in India. And when the need for the public circulation of the bill was pointed out to the State government by the central authorities in New Delhi, only 38 out of 1,400 citizens who sought to give evidence were examined. Some of them were stooges of the Communists. Out of the hundreds of amendments introduced against the bill about two-thirds were rejected on the plea that it would delay the whole procedure.

But disappointment was to come to the Communists from another quarter. Before it becomes State law, a bill must get the approval of the President of the Indian Republic. Before giving his assent, President Rajendra Prasad referred it to the Supreme Court in order to ascertain its constitutionality. The Supreme Court's decision was a victory for those who fought the bill. It declared that certain clauses violated minority rights. Moreover, some prejudicial clauses have been declared unconstitutional. The bill has now been sent back to the State legislature for reconsideration.

But the Reds received a more telling setback at the hands of Kerala's student body. The trouble began when the government, after nationalizing transportation facilities, revoked a special student fare for boat transportation in Alleppey. Representation by the students proved futile. They therefore resorted to peaceful picketing before the offices of the government-owned boat corporation. Ruthless reprisals aimed at intimidating the students touched off a State-wide student strike. Classrooms remained empty. Student leaders set up "Action Committees" all over Kerala. The students picketed government offices, police stations and transports.

The government retaliated fiercely. Between July 12 and August 2 of last year more than 8,000 boys and girls of ages varying from 10 to 18 were arrested, beaten, and starved in prison. But they showed a determination which surpassed

that of their elders. Finally when the opposition political parties threatened to join hands with the students, the government gave in and conceded all the points demanded by the students. This victory was probably the biggest blow suffered by the Communist government since it came to power. It meant that the Communists have failed to win over the youth of Kerala.

Troubles are again brewing in Kerala. Cries of insecurity and lawlessness are heard every day. The press carries reports of increasing numbers of assaults on free citizens and cold-blooded political murders. There is plenty of evidence for the complaint of the opposition that the Government has divided the people into two categories—the Communists and the non-Communists. The non-Communists are being discriminated against so that the rank and file party member may find it more profitable to be loyal to the government and others may be persuaded to join the Communist fold.

The paralysis of the police forces has left the non-party citizen no alternative but to fall back on his own resources. The situation is very tense at the moment. There are reports that the opposition parties are organizing groups of peace brigadiers. Cries of civil war are heard

from responsible circles, beginning with the Communist Chief Minister.

Meanwhile, Nehru's Congress Government at New Delhi at last seems to have grasped the gravity of the situation. Nehru has repeatedly stated that the reports on the breakdown of law and order in Kerala and the insecurity a large section of the people feel there are well founded.

The reaction of the Central Government is considered in political circles as a warning to the Communist government that, if it continues its designs to wreck democracy, New Delhi will not be a silent witness to it.¹

Such then is the dismal record of Communist rule in Kerala. Their attempt to undermine democratic institutions and to establish party government have not gone unchallenged. The most encouraging thing has been that the people have recognized the true character of communism. The opposition parties have attained a certain measure of unity. A common policy to face the totalitarian tactics of the Communists is being evolved. Moreover, honest and sincere young men who joined the party, deluded by powerful Communist propaganda, have become disillusioned and are leaving the party in disgust.

¹ According to the Indian Constitution, once it becomes clear that constitutional government has become impossible in any State of the Indian Union, the Central Government in New Delhi may intervene. On the advice of Prime Minister Nehru, President Rajendra Prasad decided to exercise his prerogative on July 30, 1959. He dissolved the Communist government of Kerala and paved the way for new elections within six months. *Editor's note.*

We will make Catholic intellectual life a vital force on the American scene when Catholic schools provide an education in faith conformed to man's personal being and to the nature of faith itself.

Faith and the Human Personality*

BERNARD J. COOKE, S.J.

SELF-CRITICISM is the mood of the moment in American educational circles. Recent months have seen a drastic re-evaluation of our educational process, precipitated by the sudden awareness that the Russian system of education may well be superior to our own. This critical self-examination coincides with the present tendency—one might almost say the present vogue—in Catholic circles in this country to re-examine the status of our American Catholic intellectual life. It is all the fashion since the now famous address of Monsignor John Tracy Ellis to speak with deprecation of the Catholic

achievement in education. This has had and will have many healthy results, but by itself such criticism is sterile and can too easily lead to discouragement and confusion of thought in American education, both Catholic and non-Catholic. What is needed now is a positive consideration of the steps required to make our Catholic intellectual life the vital and influential force it should be in the American scene.

I submit that the area in which U.S. Catholics should and can most profoundly affect American thought and life is theology. It seems to me a strange oversight that, while we

*The Aquinas Lecture, Mt. Mary College, Milwaukee, Wis., March 5, 1958.

think of raising Catholic standards of instruction in physical sciences, mathematics and social sciences, we seldom realize that the key to the whole problem is the raising of the level of our religious instruction. Yet, in an address on January 23, 1958 to the New York Catholic Youth Organization, Thomas E. Murray, special consultant to the Joint Commission on Atomic Energy, had this to say:

Whatever our need for science and technology today, our need for wisdom is greater still. Science and technology, for all their positive achievements, have created problems in our contemporary life that they themselves are powerless to solve . . . Science itself gives no guaranty that humanity shall not fall victim to scientific progress. In the field of nuclear energy, as elsewhere, the basic challenge today is put to man's wisdom—to his political wisdom, to his moral wisdom, and even to that higher religious wisdom whereby a man has some insight into the ways of God's providence. We are not yet sure whether we shall successfully meet this profound challenge. This is the reason why we must have wisdom in view, as well as science, when we think of the problem of education.

Thought Rooted in Faith

It is immediately evident that Catholic thought, in so far as it is distinguished from secular thought, is rooted in faith. Any advance in Catholic thought as such, therefore, must consist in a deeper intellectual appreciation of the faith. If this intellectual advance in faith is to be achieved by our schools, this training in faith must be integrated into

the educational endeavor as a whole. Our failure to do this has merited significant criticism. Dr. Francis Rogers, professor at Harvard and former head of the Graduate School at that university, recently remarked in an address at Assumption College:

If I have one criticism to make of American Catholic colleges, it is that they assiduously copy many of the worst features of secular education. You do not have enough confidence in yourselves and in your own glorious traditions. You dismiss Catholic theology with a mere two semester hours over three or four years, out on the fringe, added on to fifteen, seventeen, nineteen hours of subjects that often are identical with what is found elsewhere. Because you do this, your students occasionally conclude that theology is of secondary importance.

Obviously, to treat in detail the question of integrating theology into education is an immense task. It involves pedagogical, philosophical, semantic, psychological, and theological problems of considerable difficulty. My sole objective is to examine from a theological point of view the relation, if any, between the intellectual development of faith and growth in personality.

Nature of Faith

Supernatural faith is a strict mystery. Faith is at once the most sure and most obscure of human knowledges, an intellectual assent that is intrinsically and necessarily dependent upon volition. In the words of the Vatican Council it is: ". . . belief that what God has revealed

is true—not because its intrinsic truth is seen with the natural light of reason—but because of the authority of God who reveals it.” Faith is therefore an act of cognition and an act of obedience, a free submission to truth that transcends the grasp of our natural cognitive powers. As St. Thomas Aquinas tells us: “The intellect assents to something, not because it is moved sufficiently by its own proper object, but because of a choice which tends to one side rather than the other.”

If we ask what motivates this choice, I believe that St. Thomas would remind us that any choice is a combined action of intellect and will. He would then go on to show that in the act of faith each of these two powers of the soul is moved in a double way. The will is moved efficiently by the power of God’s grace and attracted finalistically by the benefits that come with acceptance of God’s revelation. The intellect, on the other hand, is also moved efficiently by grace and—though the evidence presented by reason is not necessitating—is moved by a process of investigation based upon the facts of God’s act of revealing and upon the fact of miracles.

This double nature of the act of faith, intellectual and voluntary, is clearly evident in the books of the New Testament and in the writings of the Fathers of the Church, though it is not expressed in the technical fashion of later scholastic theology. Careful reading of the Gospels reveals that faith is more

than just a knowledge about the truths that Christ taught to men; it involves at the same time a basic choice of a way of life; it involves above all a fundamental commitment of oneself to Christ. This same consecratory aspect of faith is clearly reflected in those sacral actions in which we constantly profess our faith, the seven Sacraments. Faith seen in this total sense is closely related to personality.

Notion of Personality

There are few words that have more varied definitions than the word “personality.” For our purposes here the word will be used to signify the complexus of ideas and attitudes, habits and points of view and ways of reacting to things, which we commonly refer to as an individual’s personality. But, no matter how described, it is clear that three things are central and vital in the formation and constitution of personality—1) habitual and basic personal choices flowing from some central and integrating motivation, 2) a correct sense of values (which we may call “wisdom”) and 3) confidence in the ultimate meaning of human life and the world. These three elements help us realize the important contribution faith makes to personality. It is our Christian faith that demands certain personal choices which engage the totality of our life and behavior. These choices are motivated by the personal love of God become man. This same faith gives us a sense of values that is not only human in the high-

est way, but transcends the human since it owes its origin to the divine wisdom itself. It is this same faith that alone can tell us what is the ultimate meaning of life; only faith can solve the age-old riddles of sorrow, failure, and death. As a consequence, it would seem that faith is essential for any full flowering of human personality.

Development of Personality

A person then is a being that opens out onto reality. We develop our personality in proportion as we widen our horizons. We enrich our person as we deepen our reaction to the truth, the beauty, the goodness of the persons and things that make up what we call our world. And obviously, this enrichment of our person reaches its high point in the opening of our personal lives and loves to the incomparable truth and beauty of the triune God.

But, as we so well know, the world onto which we open is immensely varied and complex, attractive and yet not uniformly good for us. The very richness of created being that is meant to fulfill our cognitive and appetitive potential can represent a danger to our true development. We can become so unpersonally immersed in these things that we allow them to dull our personality, to control and almost suppress our power of free choice which is the very key to our personal existence. Hence, any valid growth in personality must depend upon that acquisition of a correct sense of values which we associate with adult-

hood. There must exist the power, not only so to evaluate the diverse attractions of this world, but to accept this evaluation.

Yet, as important to our personal growth as are the expansion of our horizons and the acquisition of a mature sense of values, the key to the ultimate achievement of our personal potential lies in our growth in true love. Love, and it alone, is the force that can motivate, integrate, and activate our personal living. Only if our lives are governed by a fundamental devotedness to true personal goals can we have that mature control of our emotions that distinguishes the man from the child; only then will our personal choices be governed by reason, which is another way of saying that they will be completely our own choices—for the man who is controlled by his emotions is not completely master of his own actions. St. Augustine once said, "Love, and do whatever you wish." This statement is profoundly true because, if one truly loves, it is impossible to choose that which is personally demeaning.

Role of Education

It requires no special powers of perception to see that the educational process exists to bring about the three-fold growth of personality that we have just described. But precisely how, and in what measure, formal education can achieve this objective is something on which educators are far from agreed.

At present, there is grave need

in America for insistence on the true intellectual dimension of serious education. Ideas are the dynamic center of culture. There can be no transmission of culture that is divorced from the transmission of ideas. Obviously there can be no transmission of ideas unless there is thought going on in the classroom. Both teacher and student must labor through the toilsome but challenging experience of real human thought. Otherwise culture becomes stagnant and eventually corrupting.

Accompanying the transmission of ideas, there will be inevitably a transmission of the set of values that is imbedded in a culture. Moreover, the thought framework created by true teaching will give the intellectual appreciation of human goals that will guide human love; and, by forming an integrated view of man and his world, education will provide the rational pattern according to which man should conduct his life if he is to develop to the fullness of his personality.

By and large our Catholic schools have maintained, at least in theory, this notion of the supremacy of the intellectual in the scholastic process. But it has always been with a certain uneasiness. Should we not give our students more than an intellectual formation? Should we not form the whole man as Pope Pius XI says in his encyclical letter on education? Should not our Catholic school education provide a bridge to Christian living? Can we claim that our Catholic schools have been an educational success if our graduates do

not faithfully and generously practice their faith?

In the ultimate analysis I believe that this uneasy concern about a possible opposition between learning and life preparation as educational objectives is due to a twofold misconception. 1) Ultimate truth, which can be reached only by faith, is concrete and not abstract. 2) Faith which confronts these ultimate truths is not an impersonal assent to abstract truth, but a commitment to a way of life. That we have overlooked these two things seems to me to betray the fact that we have not been educating adequately the faith of our Catholic students.

Growth in Faith

But how does the education of faith fit into the process of personality growth through education? We can clarify the question by looking at the mysterious reality that we call the beatific vision. For the life of faith and the growth in ability to believe with greater conviction and clarity tend toward the beatific vision as toward their ultimate achievement. In the next life, faith will give way to vision. As St. Paul tells us: "Now I see vaguely as in a mirror, but then I shall see clearly even as I am seen" (*I Cor. 13:12*).

The knowledge of faith is therefore an inchoative participation in the beatific vision. Hence it is that the little knowledge we possess of the beatific vision helps a great deal in understanding faith. Above all, it helps us to realize that faith

is vital, that it is insight (even though incomplete), that it is the root and pledge of true and ultimate happiness.

Education in Faith

Now, if education in faith is to be a steady growth towards the knowledge of beatitude, there are certain things that education must achieve. There must be, first of all, an ever-deepening awareness of the historical factuality of revelation, an awareness that will increase the subjective certitude of faith and that will make the assent of faith increasingly mature and intellectual.

But however scientific the approach to establishing the fact of revelation, there can be no true appreciation of this fact if our Catholic educational process does not present to the minds of our students the real content of revelation, the real object of faith. This is the second point that must be stressed.

It is a good Thomist principle that a power of operation can develop only if its proper object is presented to it. Faith follows this law. An analysis of the beatific vision shows us that it is the vision of the Trinitarian life of God and its operation in and through the Incarnation. What is revealed to us is not something but someone, actually three "someones," Father, Son and Spirit. Faith can grow only if it is brought in contact with this personal object; and our Catholic education must conform itself to the divine pedagogy in which the sacramentality of the Church leads us

to the mystery of the Incarnation and the sacramentality of the Incarnation reveals the mystery of the Trinity. The Trinity is revealed through the Incarnation, the Incarnation through the Mystical Body. Education in faith cannot ignore this sequence and achieve its purpose.

If we do respect this highly personal and sacramental aspect of revelation, our religious instruction will be an exciting and profoundly enriching experience for both teacher and student. We will not only see the extent to which God controls history; we will see all history as revealing God. We will see ourselves as an integral element in this history, as revealing the Incarnation and ultimately the Trinity itself. All the treasures of human knowledge concerning personality will be exploited to help us understand the triune personality of God and the human expression of one of those personalities in Christ, and in this process our understanding of our own personality will be profoundly enriched.

Moreover, we will become aware of unsuspected depths in the vocation we have as Christians, and faith will no longer be a cold acceptance of catechism formulae; it will be a commitment to the life that is Christ. In the living out of this total commitment to Christ in His Church will come the final dimension in the growth of faith, for there is what St. Thomas calls a knowledge by connaturality that comes by living out the mysteries of

Christ's own life, by identifying our own attitudes with the redemptive attitude of Christ. It is not the function of the school as school to provide the complete or permanent situation in which this living out of the Christian commitment can become a reality, but it is the function of the Catholic school to provide an intelligent initiation into the Christian mysteries, so that the ensuing life of faith will be genuinely and maturely intelligent.

Intelligent grasp and living of the faith such as we have described it will be indeed a beginning of beatific knowledge. Our lives will be passed in the ever-deepening vision of the relation of all things to Christ and through Him to the Father. This vision will place all human values in their true perspective, will give us the wisdom that is the integration of our knowledges and the guide of our actions, will provide that detachment from the values of this world which will enable us to face life's decisions with genuine and serene freedom. This vision of faith will be for us a dynamic source of apostolic activity, because the faith is not something to be clutched to our hearts in fear and selfishness; it is meant to be shared with all mankind. Faith is a salvific force, existing to redeem the intelligences of men. Faith is not an adjunct of intellectual life; it should transform the totality of intelligent living. We American Catholics will carry on this apostolate of intellectual redemption only insofar as our Catholic schools provide an educa-

tion in faith conformed to man's personal being and to the nature of faith itself.

Personality Grows with Faith

The genuine development of human personality coincides with growth in faith. By way of illustration let us return to the three elements in personality mentioned earlier, and group under them the key points of education in faith.

1. There must be habitual and basic personal choices flowing from some central and integrating motivation. Intellectual deepening of faith which intensifies the realization of the historical actuality of God's revelation, which brings the believer into contact with the persons who form the object of faith, which grasps the fact that faith demands a total response of man to the divine vocation, brings the believer to an ever freer, ever more mature, ever more complete self-commitment in the act of faith itself.

2. There must be a correct sense of values. As we saw, it is the vision of reality grounded in a deepening insight into the mysteries of the Trinity and the Incarnation that alone can show one the true hierarchy of values. Education in faith, if it presents this integrated picture of reality, will lead to that wisdom which is the ultimate ideal of all education.

3. There must be confidence in the ultimate meaning of human life. Education in faith as we have sketched it—and it alone—will achieve this goal. For the believer

will discover that it is the divine action in history, a personal and redemptive action, that makes history understandable; and he will discover at the same time the meaning of his own human life, for he forms an integral part of this divinely guided historical process of salvation.

Practical Suggestions

Before concluding, I would like to make a few suggestions in the practical order about teaching theology to college students, suggestions which I believe would help to achieve true intellectual development of faith.

First of all, our students must be brought into contact with the word of God in the Sacred Scriptures. By this I do not mean a course in which the student learns by heart a mass of detail about the Bible, or in which he is taught to look to the sacred texts as a mine of proofs to defend his Catholic dogmas. What I am speaking about is a discovery of revelation in the form in which God expressed it, a theological study of the biblical categories of thought and the biblical events which are the symbols chosen by God to translate for human understanding the inexpressible mystery of Himself. Such study of the Bible, painstaking and rigidly scientific as it must be, is infinitely rewarding; because it brings us to immediate confrontation with the three Persons of God in their supernatural workings in history. God and His Church still speak to us in pre-eminent fashion

in the sacred texts, and no effort on the part of teacher or students is too great if it results in a genuine understanding of the word of God.

Secondly, our students should be taught the *theology* of the Church. Innumerable writers and speakers of the past quarter century have pointed out the fact that the doctrine of the Mystical Body is particularly fitted to our modern mentality and problems. Yet for the most part our teaching continues to be only a defense of the external and organizational aspects of the Church against the attacks of the Protestant Reformation. Our students hear little or nothing about the manner in which they share in the sanctifying grace that Christ possesses as Head of the Mystical Body. They hear even less about their share in the priesthood and redemptive activity of Christ. How many of them ever hear of the all-important reality of the Holy Spirit's mission as soul of the Mystical Body? Yet, this is the age of Catholic Action, when the layman is urged to play an active role in the Church's missionary function. We must equip him to do this with mature awareness of the great mystery in which he is playing a role.

Thirdly, give history back to theology and theology back to history. At present we are suffering from a dichotomy between history and theology that is disastrous. The fact is that theology is not taught, except in truncated and warped fashion, divorced from history. The very data of revelation that theology ex-

ists to exploit is historical fact; and only the theologian can give an ultimate explanation of history. Again, what I am advocating is not the cataloging of vast quantities of historical facts about Christianity. This can so easily lead to spiritual suffocation. What I would like to see is a course, or courses, in which a teacher, guided by the integrated knowledge of theology which he possesses, would unfold before the faith-enlightened gaze of his students the marvelous story of God's workings with mankind.

Finally, so that the student, now conscious of the continuing process of redemption and revelation, may himself participate in the Christian mysteries maturely and intelligently, there must be a vital liturgy. It seems an anomaly to spend long

hours telling our students about the mysteries of faith, striving to bring them to a confrontation with God and to a knowledge of the Christian dimension of their lives—and then, on the other hand, neglect to bring them into intelligent personal touch with the mysteries themselves present on our altars. May I hazard the opinion that liturgy is part of the educational process itself, an indispensable part. Lack of intelligent sacramental life means a serious lacuna in one's intellectual grasp of the faith; and it is clear how tragic a loss it is for Christian personality development if there is no appreciation that the Mass is the focal act of self-commitment that is intended to govern our lives. It is in the Mass that faith and personality find their fullest expression.



Two Kinds of Secularism

Most of our educational institutions are and will probably remain secular, in the sense that they are not controlled by any church and are open to everybody regardless of his religious faith or lack of it. But there is another kind of secularism that besets the higher learning in America, and that is secularism in the sense in which we say that religion is insignificant, it is outmoded, it is equivalent to superstition. This kind of secularism higher education can and should repel. If a college or university is going to think and to think about important things, then it must think about religion. It is perhaps not necessary that all the faculty should be religious; it would be desirable that most of them, at least, should take religion seriously.—*Robert M. Hutchins, President of the Fund for the Republic, as quoted in the CATHOLIC MESSENGER, Davenport, Iowa, May 28, 1959.*

To the Clergy of Venice*

JOHN XXIII

BELOVED SONS:

FORTY years from the day of his birthday into his heavenly home, Pius X has returned for a few days to Venice, to his earthly homeland, to the field of his apostolate, into the midst of the humble and generous people who always remained so close to his heart as well as among the cares and anxieties of his most high pontifical dignity.

We have wished to see the realization of this glorious transfer of his mortal remains ever since 1954, and as soon as We were called by God to Our second ascent, succeeding to the Chair of Peter, We hastened to its accomplishment. Beyond our fondest dreams, We now see this wish crowned with triumph—and what a triumph!—the people acclaiming at one and the same time their son and their father, their most shining glory in modern times and their illustrious patron, and doing this with such an intense fervor that We may hope for most edifying fruits in the interior renewal of many souls.

We see you at this moment with the eyes of the heart, beloved sons, gathered in St. Mark's with your venerable bishops from every part of the Three Venices (Trentine Venetia, Giulian Venetia, Venetian Venetia). With you We approach the blessed reliquary, placed under the great cupola of the golden basilica, facing the altar of St. Mark the Evangelist, not far from the much venerated Madonna of Nicopeia, and close to the historic pulpit from which were once heard the sound and clear teaching and the sweet eloquence of the Patriarch Sarto,

*A letter to the priests of the Venice area gathered in pilgrimage before the body of St. Pius X, temporarily placed in St. Mark's basilica, April 23, 1959.

whom We heard with Our own ears as a 15-year-old youth at Sant' Alessandro in Colonna at Bergamo.

It is quite natural that the clergy and people, but particularly the clergy, should wonder as to what new thing Pius X brings with him in his return to Venice almost a half century after his departure. What useful exhortations does he bring, they might ask, in the interest of ecclesiastical life determined by present-day conditions? The majesty of death and the unanimously acclaimed glorification accorded him give a special meaning to the teachings of this great man, this famous saint.

Although one bears in mind the variations of age, which in their turbulent succession repeat the values and defects of every generation—young men who react to the fascination of the new and who want to surpass their elders, sometimes with a certain presumption; mature men who are tempted to choose more in favor of what suits their own convenience rather than what is for the common good—the commitments of the priest are many and serious, however, and impose themselves on the attention and consciousness of each one of them.

Pius X has returned into the midst of his own, to those who are especially close to him by reason of holy ordination, and he solemnly recalls three points of priestly life that are especially interesting in every epoch of history. The luminous survival of the figure of Pius X so accentuated now, the fascination, which we now witness, that he exercises on souls and on Catholics all over the world—all these recall to Our mind the priestly dignity, the love of the holy Church and the human and Christian wisdom particularly suited to our lives, called as we are to be "*lumen mundi, sal terrae*" (light of the world, salt of the earth).

These are three elements of prime importance for the edification of our life, dear priests, and for the efficaciousness of your ministry. They are three admonitions of that "*sacerdos magnus Dei excelsi*" (supreme priest of the Most High), the object of such spontaneous popular love and proposed for the imitation of all.

Above and beyond the anecdotes and traits of good nature which, repeated and altered, could diminish his stature as a man, a distinguished priest and a shepherd of souls, Pius X appears in his true character, one might say, more holy and more austere, but tempered on the other hand by that sense of great understanding, so evident in his smile and in his warm words.

Priestly Dignity

In Book four, Chapter five, of the *Imitation of Christ*, the author describes in masterful outline the characteristic greatness of the priest as seen by heaven and earth: "*Grande ministerium et magnum dignitas sacerdotum, quibus datum est quod Angelis ipsis non est concessum*" (Great dignity of priests, to whom it is granted what is not granted to angels).

The ministry of grace then is a singular privilege.

This dignity is part of the vocation itself. It defines itself little by little in clerical investiture, in the conferring of tonsure, in the elevation to holy orders, in the canonical mission, which is a complete poem of respect and of love of the Holy Church for souls and of trust in her priests.

The Council of Trent, in whose sessions the requirements for a perfect preparation of the priest for his very high duties were given a most sensitive review, reminds us with solemn and penetrating words what We on several occasions allowed Ourselves to whisper, almost in prayer, to the seminarians and priests of Our dear Venice. The lofty and very solemn words of the Council of Trent (Sess. XXIII, chap. 18): "*Sic decet omnino clericos in sortem Domini vocatos ut habitu, gestu, incessu, sermone nihil nisi grave, moderatum ac religione plenum praeseferant*" (So teach all clerics called by God to a vocation to conduct themselves in appearance, gesture, gait and conversation with grave, moderate and religious manner). These are precise expressions, worthy of being borne in mind and repeated like the "*Gloria Patri*" of the breviary.

Christian people, in spite of changing tastes and the weakening of the ancient spirit of mustering around the parish, still want the priest to be worthy, enlightened, amiable and saintly.

Unfortunately, the dust of worldliness seems to confuse and envelop everything. But the requirements of ecclesiastical dignity remain intact in the general opinion and in the innermost intimacy of hearts, and even among children.

If the priest is alive like fire and is therefore shining, pure and ardent, he is worth everything. If he is otherwise, he is worth very little, even in the estimation of those people who have momentarily deserted the practice of their religion.

The *Haerent Animo* (Exhortation to the Clergy) of St. Pius X, upon which we meditated at Castelfranco on September 18 last year in marking the centenary of its author's ordination and the 50th anniver-

sary of the publication itself, poured forth from the burning heart of Pius X, exactly like a paternal lamentation, to recall the diocesan and regular clergy of the entire world to a more intense interior life and to sanctification.

Beloved priests! If Pius X penetrated the consciousness of the people, if he still stirs them, if the teaching Church today still draws from his teaching, it is because of the fact that he felt, lived and enjoyed that most high dignity and conformed to it without effort and naturally in every circumstance of his life, from assistant chaplain to Supreme Pontiff.

In the first place, and side by side with other cares for the timely modernizing of pastoral techniques and the application of new ways to approach the various categories of the faithful, take special care of your soul. We say this to you with all simplicity and with paternal familiarity.

The pure and ardent soul of a priest is a mystery of light, of grace and of love. The angels of heaven admire it and see in it the reflection of Divine Majesty.

Happy is the priest who discharges the daily obligations of prayer with faithful care; who loves the seclusion of the church and of his home; who derives the living substance of his preaching from the Holy Book; who in his judgments, words and manners conforms to the examples of Our Lord, of His mother and of the saints; who does not hold excessive trust in human resources.

Since holiness is necessary to him for the salvation of his soul and for the efficaciousness of his apostolate, every priest must take the greatest care to approach the Sacrament of Penance and to make use of all those supports suggested by experience and approved by the Church.

"Therefore, if the priest is enhanced with all the virtues, he is like an excellent salt and all the people take their seasoning from him, more by seeing him than from hearing him. Because the first teaching is to see good but the second is to hear it" (St. John Chrysostom, 10th Homily on Matt., *opus imperfectum*, PG 33, 685).

The Church

Situations change, but the difficulties put in the way of the Church in the fulfillment of its divine mission are never wanting. To those people who are surprised, who too credulously trust in a dawn of absolute earthly repose and easy conquests, We recall the pages of blood and glory written by the martyrs and doctors always in defense and

in honor of the sacred deposit entrusted to the Church by Christ. The Church of the times of Pius X kept its place with dignity and pride. Unfortunately, certain people forced the door. Others attempted clamorous and regrettable undertakings. But the shadows of night spread over that clamor.

Pius X, gentle and humble of heart, did not bow to the violence of the powerful of the earth nor to the flattery of the dialecticians of the various schools. He left the illustrious example of his valiant love for the Sacred Book and for the sources of grace.

To that man who described him as "a poor parish priest of the Venetian countryside," and who imagined him as almost confused and lost in the immensity of pontifical duties, Pius X proved the high measure of his clear-sightedness as universal master and shepherd, particularly by certain acts which were the most significant of his government: namely, the creation of the Biblical Institute; the preparation of the Code of Canon Law; the reorganization of the Roman Congregations; the invitation to adults to receive Communion frequently and granting its reception to children of tender age, for the protection of innocence and good morals; the repudiation of political shrewdness alone as a means of defense by the ecclesiastical class and as a defense of the inalienable rights of revealed truth and of the freedom of souls.

Beloved priests! The interior structure of the Church is the strength it derives from the conviction that it must remain faithful to the mission entrusted to it by its Divine Founder, without fear of appearing or of being sometimes judged severe or too prudent.

This Church that does not need anyone entrusts itself to all its children.

As a divine institution the Church represents all that one can imagine as being certain and trustworthy for the salvation of man, as well as in the order of human relations and in the efforts to solve the cares related to the daily maintenance of social peace and collaboration among peoples.

Keeping in mind the brightest pages of the history of centuries, one can well understand that the Ecumenical Council—which We announced after heeding an inspiration whose spontaneity We felt, in the humility of Our soul, as a sudden and unexpected impulse—is preparing, in the intimate ranks of the episcopacy and the priesthood, to accomplish the good intention of every ecclesiastic, namely, a more anxious desire to enlarge the areas of charity and to maintain its place with clarity of thought and greatness of heart.

We hope and pray that the council will renew above all that scene

in which the apostles assembled in Jerusalem after the ascension of Jesus into heaven: unanimity of thought and of prayer with Peter and around Peter, the shepherd of the lambs and of the sheep; the offering of energies that strengthen themselves and renew themselves in the search of what might better conform to the daily needs of the apostolate.

The figure of St. Pius X, invoked also as the heavenly protector of the Ecumenical Council, is separate from the events and circumstances of his times which gave rise to irresponsible and interested judgments, and it makes more persuasive the call to seek new ways for the salvation of man and the defense of his rights. It persuades one also in knowing that easy diversions cannot be conceived as displacing what is rooted in the very essence of the most sound institutions or to put aside the worth of centuries-old experience. By this We mean to say: in the East first, a step closer, then a step still closer, and finally the perfect reunion of so many separated brothers with the ancient common Mother; and in the West, the generous pastoral collaboration of the two clergies under the watchfulness and direction of the Bishop who is the shepherd of all the lambs.

Human and Christian Wisdom

The episode, which We saw with Our own eyes, in which St. Pius X on the day of his coronation appeared disturbed by the acclamations of the crowds, is indicative of his mentality and character.

He loved the people and understood their enthusiasm. Afterward he willingly gave in to them. But that head bent forward, that slow and brief gesture of benediction, those eyes reddened with tears, that hesitant smile, remained in the memory of those who had the fortune of witnessing that ceremony of August 9, 1903. It was an indication of the interior discipline of that Venetian priest, the real meaning of whose good nature was soon understood by all.

The priest must have a sense of measure in everything, in conduct and in cordial courtesy. You understand what We mean. The faithful do not like to see you immersed in earthly affairs, as though you were to solve everything within the period of one generation. And they do not appreciate the priest who shows himself to be too effusive and partial. One must know how to wear everywhere and with great dignity the noble and distinguished cassock. It is the image of Christ's tunic, "*Christus sacerdotum tunica*," the shining sign of the interior vestment of grace.

In days of wrath, it is a great merit to know how to control oneself, so that friends may find you in control of even your generous impulses, and so that adversaries, wherever you meet them, may always consider you gentlemen, whatever the test.

Beloved sons! The world feels and will always feel the attraction of goodness and sanctity. You are the witnesses of this during the days while Pius X is in Venice.

Why do the people invoke this saint? Why do they seek him? Why do they love him?

The answer is easy. There existed in him the marvelous combination of those positive gifts that are proper and characteristic of every social class. He was pure as are the children of the land; frank and strong like the workers of our shops; patient like the men of the sea; deliberate like the shepherds of the flocks; noble and austere like the descendants of the greatest families; affable and just like a teacher or a magistrate; good and generous as one imagines the saints must really have been.

Let us all persevere in this search and in this love of the human and Christian virtues, natural and supernatural. And let us pray the Lord to make us desire ever more increasingly this balance of energies and of enthusiasms. The people will run after us, not to seek us, nor to attach themselves to us, but to arrive together with us at the meeting with Jesus Christ who is "the shepherd and guardian of our souls" (cf. *1 Peter* 2:25).

O St. Pius, our glorious Patriarch and Pontiff, fearless and kind, always protect the Venetian clergy, for whom you remain the very special splendor and honor. Protect all the clergy of Italy, all the Catholic clergy of the world. Sustain in their resistance and in the joy of truth those hundreds and thousands of our brothers who are subjected to difficult trials through persecution and oppression of their most sacred freedoms. Sustain them, whether in vast or small regions, whether near or far, sustain them who are the lamentation and the tears of the Church of the Lord.

The words of Jesus come true for many. "In the world you will have affliction" (*John* 16: 33). It is our sacred duty to carry in our hearts and remember in our prayers the daily intention of these suffering and distressed brothers. Through your intercession, O Pius, our Pontiff, may the words of Jesus come true once again and forever: "I have overcome the world" (*John* 16: 33).

With every confidence that Our words will find a ready and generous response in you, and as a pledge of the most choice heavenly graces and of the powerful intercession of St. Pius X in your behalf, beloved sons, We impart with all Our heart, first to the Lord Cardinal, Patriarch of Our dear Venice, and to the archbishops and bishops assembled there, and also to the entire diocesan and regular clergy, and to the seminarians of the Three Venices, Our apostolic benediction.

Given at Rome at St. Peter's, April 21, 1959, the first year of Our pontificate.

The Purpose of the Catholic Press*

JOHN XXIII

WE CORDIALLY welcome you, journalists and associates of the Italian Catholic press and general publishing media, meeting in Rome for the third national convention.

It could be said that the convention has been carried out along two different lines: one organizational and technical and the other spiritual and of the apostolate.

Regarding the first with which We are familiar, We do not intend to dwell on it with you. We realize its importance well enough. It suffices to reflect that probably because of the little care given in the past to this area, the Catholic press, in general, did not have that influence over public opinion which was exercised by other newspapers technically well produced and which, therefore, had an easier time in conveying opinion and viewpoints not always in line with Catholic doctrine.

Glancing over the program of your work of the last few days, We noticed the variety and importance of the themes dealt with regarding this question. We are glad of it. We encourage you to be healthily modern in this matter.

Having said this, We wish to record how the whole pattern of your congress is permeated with a strong desire for expansion and uplifting and We praise you for it. But if your apostolate is to be effective for

*An address to the Italian Catholic Press Congress, May 4, 1959.

the cause of God, of the Church and of souls, the ends for which you use the instruments of your profession must always be borne in mind. Those instruments are above all "*arma veritatis*" (weapons of truth).

The defection from the age-old philosophy by modern thought has caused many people to neglect divine truth. They act as if divine truth were not the reasonable object of human intelligence. Modern philosophical relativism repeats the sceptical question of Pilate: "What is truth?" (*John* 18: 38). But you know well that God is essentially truth. Christ is truth (*John* 14: 6). The Holy Ghost is the spirit of truth (*John* 16: 13). The reflection of this divine light, Dante would say (cfr. *Paradise* 1-2-3), "penetrates through the universe and shines more in one part and less elsewhere," but it penetrates above all in the most intimate part of the human mind that is made for the knowledge of truth and for the love derived therefrom: "*Quid anima desiderat*," exclaims St. Augustine, "*nisi veritatem*?" (What does the mind desire unless truth?)

It is the duty of every man, therefore, and all the more of every Christian, to bear witness to truth. In a completely specialized world you journalists must, because of the demands of professional conscience, be the cultivators of truth, so that truth, so often trampled upon and betrayed by the communications media, may triumph.

Catholic journalists, writers and workers in the field, moreover, are called to a still higher responsibility. Their media are not, in fact, only for truth, but also charity. The "*arma caritatis*" (weapons of love) are directed toward elevating the mind, building up what is good and radiating virtue in souls.

We do not wish to pause to draw a sad picture of the evil which so much printed matter produces with its immorality and malice. It is with a truly afflicted and anguished mind that We consider the enormous harm created in so many consciences, above all in the consciences of youth, by certain printed matter, by the written word and even more by illustrations. May the Lord grant that there be few parents who do not feel the serious duty they have of not cooperating in the ruination of their children. We know, in fact, that a dangerous trap is created by those illustrated dailies and periodicals which offer an attractive mixture of the serious and profane—and sometimes even indecent—under the pretext of giving complete information or of publicity. It is precisely to replace this apparently harmless and, therefore, all the more pernicious printed matter within Christian families that there

must be organizational and technical progress in the Catholic publishing field, so that the Catholic press may thus become a matter of substance.

There is, finally, a certain press that sins seriously against truth and against charity. It lies to inspire hatred; it seems to have as its sole program to lead simple souls to perdition, to distort the truth every day, to interpret incorrectly every expression of the Church's teaching authority and to deal blows to the Church so as to take love away from Christ, to fight Jesus Christ in order to fight God Himself. And this often under the deceitful guise of hastening the solution of problems which harass the workers, the weak and the undefended.

With what spirit, therefore, should you use the instruments of the press? "In all things," We say to you with St. Paul, "taking up the shield of faith with which you may be able to quench all the fiery darts of the most wicked one. And take unto you the helmet of salvation and the sword of the spirit, that is, the word of God" (*Ephes.* 6: 16-17).

In the same letter to the Ephesians, St. Paul offers the motto which can guide the steps of each one on this arduous road: "Practice the truth in love" (*Ephes.* 4: 14). In love! Love in writing and also in polemics does not weaken the truth; indeed, it strengthens it because it makes it more acceptable. "*Interficate errores*" (destroy error), said St. Augustine, "*diligite errantes*" (love the erring). Without renouncing any of the rights of truth, how much sweeter it would be if one used in polemics "less vinegar and more honey," according to the well known phrase of St. Francis de Sales.

We would like to point out as model for the Christian polemicist a great Italian layman who, in his polemics, was an example of humility and charity, Alessandro Manzoni. In his *Observations on Catholic Morals* he presents himself to the reader as the "weak but sincere apologist of a moral whose goal is love," and though feeling "the duty to speak for truth" he always keeps his polemics under the shield of charity. May it be likewise with you, fearless defenders of truth, but nevertheless loyal and generous with adversaries because "the love of Christ impels us" (*II Cor.* 4: 15) always and everywhere.

We cannot now take leave of you without saying to all (and to each one according to his specific activity and competence) an explicit word of warm encouragement to spend your individual energies for the prosperity and circulation of a good press in the most vast and profound meaning of the phrase.

The apostolate of the press in all its forms! Above all, the dailies, so that they may be visible everywhere. But then also the weeklies which in every family today are almost the indispensable complement of the daily newspaper. Here more than anywhere else technical perfection is necessary. We also stress the importance of periodicals, especially the missionary ones and those for cultured, literary or scientific people. Finally, give all the support you can to Catholic agencies. It is superfluous to stress how necessary they are and how delicate is their activity. And last, but not least, We must mention the love of good books.

The apostolate of the good press, We said, of the good books. But the goodness must not only be found in the purpose and in the intentions of the publishers. It must also be in the substance of the works produced—good that coincides with what is true, which leads Us to stress the need that the contents be of a high value. Prepare newspapers, books and publications of value and you will thereby be apostles yourselves because the word is the conqueror and is together truth, love and beauty, reflecting Supreme Wisdom, the First Love, Eternal Beauty.

Integration and the Christian Conscience*

MOST REV. ALBERT G. MEYER
Archbishop of Chicago

I HAVE been asked to appear before you as the representative of His Excellency, Archbishop Albert G. Meyer, in order that he may convey to you some studied beliefs in the important matter upon which you are deliberating.

On November 14th of last year the Roman Catholic bishops of the United States, not for the first time, condemned segregation in all forms and reasserted the doctrine of the absolute equality of the human being before both God and law. Yet there was a new element of urgency in their message when they said:

*A statement to the President's Commission on Civil Rights, delivered by Very Rev. John J. Egan, Chicago, Ill., May 6, 1959.

... we hope and earnestly pray that responsible and sober-minded Americans of all religious faiths, in all areas of our land, will seize the mantle of leadership from the agitator and the racist. It is vital that we act now and act decisively. All must act quietly, courageously, and prayerfully before it is too late.

The plain implication of the bishops' pronouncement is that all men of good will agree in principle and that the time has come to translate our principles into fact. It is here that difficulties make themselves apparent. Yet the position of the bishops in their statement is that we must overcome the obstacles and resolve what is the most serious moral challenge to us who are Christians and Americans.

How is this to be done?

In order to answer the question, we may find it helpful to examine where we stand in the light of history. If we do, we shall discover a surprising similarity between our problems today and those of the Reconstruction Era. The Negro population had been declared free and equal by executive fiat and constitutional amendment, but no one at the time knew what these words might mean in the daily life of men. Thirty years had to pass by between the Emancipation Proclamation and our invention of a system of living that was hoped would reconcile the realities of society with our new definition of the place of all men in the Republic.

The past decade has shown us that the ideas and practices summed up in the phrase "separate but equal" could not even serve a century. This last in the long series of racial compromises in American history has failed for a number of reasons.

Cause of Our Failure

The collapse of the compromise solution that issued from the Reconstruction may have in great measure been due to events outside our nation. The dreadful twin scourge of communism and fascism has recalled to all of us the precious worth of the human person. When, in the middle of the 20th century, it was often said that Negroes were the possessors of a kind of second-class citizenship, we found ourselves denying it, for that assertion carries with it the still worse one that there can be such a thing as a second-class human being. Ideas of that stamp are repugnant to us, as the Catholic bishops pointed out when they quoted Pius XII as saying: "All men are brothered in Jesus Christ, for He, though God, became also man, became a member of the human family, a brother of all."

Now, in effect, a new Emancipation Proclamation has been promulgated.

It might perhaps be shown that the days we are living through are not dissimilar to the painful and turbulent ones of the Reconstruction Epoch. The question arises whether or not we must anticipate another thirty-year period of experiment and failure until we learn to put this new Emancipation Proclamation into effect. Only the yet undiscovered future will satisfactorily answer the question, but, if the reasoning of the Catholic bishops be correct, we are no longer permitted to adopt a detached attitude of "wait and see." Otherwise it would be unlikely that they would say, as they did: ". . . these problems are vital and urgent. May God give this nation the grace to meet the challenge it faces. For the sake of generations of future Americans, and indeed of all humanity, we cannot fail." These exigent and prayerful words were not composed lightly, nor would their authors use language of such vigor unless they believed it is incumbent upon us to act now.

Unhappily, many of us who have studied the problem have learned that it is easier to apprehend and acknowledge the moral law than to give it effect. Our duty appears clear enough but the means of carrying it out uncertain. Perhaps the remarks of the American Catholic bishops on how to proceed may be of use to us when they say:

It is a sign of wisdom, rather than weakness, to study carefully the problems we face, to prepare for advances, and to by-pass the non-essential if it interferes with essential progress. We may well deplore a gradualism that is merely a cloak for inaction. But we equally deplore rash impetuosity that would sacrifice the achievements of decades in ill-timed and ill-considered ventures.

If we are to accept this wise advice, we must attempt to establish what is possible to accomplish now and what is manifestly out of the question at this time. By so doing, we ought to be able to distinguish between what the bishops saw fit to call "gradualism that is merely a cloak for inaction" and "ill-timed and ill-considered ventures."

An Historical Parallel

In many respects the arrival of large numbers of our Negro co-citizens in northern cities like Chicago is akin to the coming, in former times, of similar numbers of persons from Europe. In both cases the people looked forward to a new life of social, economic, political, and spiritual progress. The European migrants of the past began their American ad-

ventures in national districts or ghettos. For a time, their lack of education and familiarity with our nation's traditions and way of life prevented them from enjoying a full measure of citizenship. In addition, it would not be incorrect to say that they suffered, to a greater or lesser extent, from social and economic disabilities imposed by a sometimes scornful, sometimes suspicious native population. These European peoples were segregated and discriminated against.

Our attention, however, ought to be drawn to the subsequent history of the many different European peoples who once lived in the national compounds that our cities enclosed. With the passage of time, these people learned the English language, they learned our laws, our social practices. What is more, they equipped and trained themselves to occupy positions requiring high skill, professional knowledge and great responsibility. In short, they began to produce a middle class that was capable and desirous of taking its place in the mainstream of American life. As this new type of person developed, the strictures and confining bonds of the older national communities began to dissolve. As disabilities against persons of European ancestry faded, the residents of old national ghettos found they had the choice of remaining where they were or moving into neighborhoods and communities frequently designated as English-speaking or "more typically American." Having satisfied the educational, social and economic requirements, the former European immigrant or his child was in a position to make the choice. The option was his; he could stay or leave at his pleasure.

The Negro in Our Society

It is indisputable that America now boasts of many Negroes who have made the ascent into the middle classes. Negro college graduates and professionals of every sort there is do not constitute the rarity they did only a short twenty years ago. As the Catholic bishops pointed out, there have been "great and even spectacular advances." It is no longer possible to speak of some distant time when there may be a significant number of Negroes who by education, economic position or style of life will be able to live as other American citizens do. We now have many such people teaching in the classrooms of our universities, pleading cases in our law courts, performing operations in our hospitals, and in short doing work that only the highest intelligences most perfectly trained are capable of.

Has this new and rapidly increasing Negro middle class been able to choose its place of residence as the children of our European immigrants were able to do? Does the fully competent Negro person have the option we alluded to above? Unfortunately, the only honest answer we can give it, at best, is a qualified no. In some very few instances, notably where new communities have been erected in their entirety, Negroes have been able to purchase or rent on the same terms as their white fellow citizen. Yet in Chicago, as in many other places, we are forced to conclude such examples are distressingly rare.

In our opinion, gradualism would be "merely a cloak for inaction" if we do not turn our immediate attention to the legitimate claims of middle class Negroes who wish to leave the ghetto or ethnic neighborhood. They have shown, like their predecessors of European extraction, that they possess the educational, social and economic ability to step from the wings of our national life on to the central stage.

We all must wish, work and pray for the disappearance of all disabling restrictions based on race, religion and national ancestry, but such evils cannot easily be terminated at a stroke. We ought to concentrate and insist on the not inconsiderable accomplishments that could be ours now.

This, it seems, is the case with residential integration. The Negro middle classes ought to have the choice of leaving the ethnic community if they so wish, nor is it rash on our part to suggest that the time has come for practical measures to that end.

"We urge," the Catholic hierarchy said, "that concrete plans in this field be based on prudence." They added that "prudence may be called a virtue that inclines us to view problems in their proper perspective. It aids us to use the proper means to secure our aims." The November, 1958 statement also quite correctly observed that "among all races and national groups, class distinctions are inevitably made on the basis of like-mindedness of a community of interests. Such distinctions are normal and constitute a universal social phenomenon. They are accidental, however, and are subject to change as conditions change." Thus it is the restrictions against the most capable and self-reliant portions of the Negro population which call the loudest for remedy and which must be rectified most speedily.

Although it is true there are now large numbers of Negroes in an economic position to leave their segregated communities quite easily, that does not absolve us of our duty to continue to work for a complete

desegregation. It is unthinkable that the accident of wealth and opportunity should serve as a criterion for enjoying the rights of citizenship. It remains to discuss how we might gain the end we seek.

Growth of the Negro Ghetto

Until the late forties or early fifties the great majority of the rising Negro population in Chicago was obliged to wedge itself in a confined territorial area the borders of which expanded but slowly. Because of the court decisions making the restrictive covenant unenforceable and because of the quickly augmenting purchasing power of the Negro population, the more recent years have seen the Negro areas of the city grow with alacrity. There seems to be little doubt that, if nothing else, the expansion of the Negro ghetto has alleviated the housing shortage which has been visited on many Negroes in the city. It has not, we are compelled to note, eliminated it.

While the opportunities for Negroes to rent or purchase more adequate housing have increased as the substantially all-Negro areas of the city have grown, there has been only the slightest observable diminution in the degree of racial, residential segregation. It would appear that most communities have made little or no effort to absorb a number of Negroes whose social backgrounds, occupations and standard of living is comparable to that of the white inhabitants. Where it might have been hoped that the white population would stay, they have fled. Some districts have even reported a total depopulation and repopulation within the incredibly short space of twenty-four months.

The first Negroes to move into many of these once white communities were people whose last thought was to drive the original inhabitants away. In many cases the first Negroes to arrive were individuals who wanted to leave the old ethnic community because they thought, and were right in so thinking, that they had much more in common with the people into whose neighborhoods they were moving. Nevertheless the old inhabitants vanished. Worse yet, there have been occasional outbreaks of violence.

The city's intense spirit of community and neighborhood has long enriched every aspect of its life. Frequently Chicagoans who are asked where they live do not reply by naming the street their house is on, but by saying they are from Ravenswood, Garfield Park or Chatham. We are a city of communities where home, church and neighborhood life are remarkably important. Despite the tender regards and affections

we bring to our community life, our city has been no more immune to vast and dynamic urban change than others. We too have been worried by the threat of physical deterioration, by leaping school populations, by transportation problems, by all the surprising and new factors that have become the usual thing in American urban life since World War II's end.

Depending on the community in question it is fair to say that our community life, and the confidence we once had in our communities has, to some extent, been shaken. Like the people in other cities all over the nation we are only learning of all the complexities of cooperation and program that are necessary for safeguarding and improving the unique and happy design of life that is Chicago.

If we were to say that many of Chicago's communities were unprepared to solve this great national problem, who is to point out a city that was prepared? In some communities where white people lived a short time ago, instead of organization for constructive purposes, there was rumor, myth, and eventually fear finally giving way to panic. Some people thought that admission of a Negro into a heretofore white community would depress the value of their properties by throwing them all on the market at once. Stories were circulated that if a single Negro moved into a community, no matter how fine the individual might be, that the inhabitants would flee.

Under the circumstances, the white neighborhoods near the ever-growing Negro ghetto were pervaded with gloom and confusion. People freely predicted the present inhabitants would be gone in two, five or ten years. As more people prophesied an inauspicious future, not only the communities' people but their institutions, banks, churches, businesses, and schools began to act as though this soothsaying was demonstrated fact. Some few involved themselves in impractical schemes to buy property lest it be sold to Negro purchasers. Others let themselves listen to rash and uninformed men. Most did nothing but prepare themselves psychologically for abandoning the various communities. Some began to leave even before any Negroes had come. There were people who spoke of communities near the Negro areas as "threatened," and thereby discouraged other white people from moving in. The copestone of uncertainty, gloom, and confusion are the few individuals in the city known as "block-busters," men who are accused of fostering community panic in order to manipulate real estate prices artificially and thereby gain a profit.

We are, therefore, forced to the conclusion that the forebodings of the white population came true in a number of instances because they made them come true. By predicting the worst, the worst came to pass. Had there been cooperation between individuals, between churches, between business institutions; had there been planning, had there been constructive programing of many different kinds, we believe that many communities could have been stabilized so that a truly free market would have been created. A free market would have permitted the entrance into white middle class communities of a proportion of Negro families who could only be considered an asset in any neighborhood.

These communities or individuals who have attempted to press on and enforce outmoded policies have discovered the price of such actions in the creation of a sequence of events within the community that leads inevitably, as we pointed out above, to its disappearance.

Residential segregation is destructive, wasteful, and if the truth be said, the unjust processes need not be infinite. Our course of action can be based on something more substantial than *faute de mieux*.

The Need for Leadership

"... We hope and earnestly pray that responsible and soberminded Americans of all religious faiths ... will seize the mantle of leadership from the agitator and the racist" were the words of our bishops. This hope and this prayer are not extravagant. Our communities are capable of far-seeing and united action. The individuals in them, their businesses and industries, our Catholic parishes, the Protestant churches, the Synagogues and Temples have the leadership and ability to work out a variety of forms of local cooperation in order to stabilize the populations, to control and guide conservation and development, and to make sure Negroes of like economic and social backgrounds do gain admission in a manner that is harmonious, and a credit to us as Christians and Americans.

The lynch-pin of our difficulties is the acknowledgment of the interplay of forces in our communities. The simple introduction of Negroes must continue to result in white depopulation, and the consequent enlargement of segregation, unless it is clearly understood that, in the community, our "racial problem" is securely tied to the physical and social conditions, to morale, to controlling irresponsible real estate speculation and discriminatory financing, to all aspects of community life.

Disunited communities that lack cohesiveness, over-all organization

of some description, and effective and informed leadership of the highest caliber are not capable of responding either to the imperatives of the racial situation or of the general urban crisis that in fact is so closely allied to it.

We cannot afford to neglect the fact that the housing shortage for Negroes measurably complicates our efforts toward desegregation. The pressure generated by the shortage results in Negroes coming into white areas in numbers so large that, instead of gaining integration, we discover we have merely extended the segregated enclave.

Exactly what an "integrated" community might be, no one, we believe, can say with certainty. Obviously it is one in which significant numbers of people of both the major races reside.

Among the remedies at our disposal, two recommend themselves. First, we must eliminate the housing shortage for Negroes. Secondly, we must have community organization to ensure that Negroes do gain access to our communities, but not to the degree that we merely extend the boundaries of the racial ghetto.

Our communities will, we believe, learn that they must dispose their human and material resources in such a fashion that they are the masters of the trends of the time, rather than allow circumstances to master them. As communities gain a control over their own future, they shall be excellently situated for seeing to it that Negroes are welcomed in a number and manner that will both assure them continued existence and growth, and at the same time accord to the Negro middle classes the rights that are incontestably theirs.

As times change we must change ourselves. The older practices of unilateral action are not suited for this complex era. No single person, interest, church or group can be the sole custodian of our communities. It will be necessary for representative interests to discover how they can plan, work and meet the future together.

"The heart of the race question is moral and religious. It concerns the rights of man and our attitude toward our fellow men." So spoke our American Roman Catholic hierarchy. And they are right in what they say, for there comes an end to the effectiveness of legislation or the value of organized action. Every person must inquire into the moral problem by himself, alone. Even so, it remains our pastoral duty to urge all not to postpone the inner examination upon which, in the last analysis, the ultimate solution depends.

We should like to thank the honorable Commissioners for their

gracious invitation to testify. We know the importance of the Commission's work, and only hope that our testimony will be of some service. It is our intention to do all we can to encourage and aid programs of the nature we have been describing, but, as the gentlemen here know full well, the problems we face are not the sort that lend themselves to facile correction. Nevertheless we trust you will do us the kindness of repeating your visit, at which time we can report progress that will do honor to God and the nation.

The Right to Migrate*

THE AUSTRALIAN HIERARCHY

IN APRIL, 1951, for the occasion of the 50th Year of the Founding of the Commonwealth of Australia, His Holiness Pope Pius XII addressed a personal letter to the Hierarchy of Australia. In it were these words:

In recalling your good works, We should not fail to mention the spirit of Christian charity which opened the doors of your country to welcome so large a number of dispossessed victims of the War and of those constrained to emigrate by unemployment and the pressure of surplus populations.

It is this "spirit of Christian charity" which is desired shall be brought to mind in marking the annual commemoration of Immigration Sunday, the purpose of which is the procuring of a right conscience in regard to migration matters, and of uniting in prayer and sacrifice Catholics and their migrant brethren everywhere.

Prejudices and antipathies which create opposition to migrants and migration, and which raise obstacles to any extension of migration programs, are, more often than not, the result of a lack of knowledge and understanding of man's inherent right to emigrate. With this lack of knowledge and understanding there are linked often selfish fears of loss of employment, of power and of authority or predominance, social

*Excerpts from a statement read in all the churches of Australia on Immigration Sunday, February 23, 1959.

and religious. Such fears ought to be disregarded as unworthy of thinking people, and, with Christians, as reprehensible and as doing violence to those basic Christian principles which proclaim the sacred character of the human personality and the inviolable rights in the social order of individuals and families.

Moreover, it is of the essence of Christian charity, as well as according with the natural law itself, that the migrant shall be considered as one made unto God's likeness in his soul; that, normally, he is one who, prompted by a sense of personal dignity and a will to acquire the necessities of life, seeks abroad opportunity and means to establish himself and his dependents in a manner befitting his sense of human dignity.

Catholics, in their attitude towards immigrants, have the unparalleled possibility of demonstrating to the whole community that the marks of the Church Universal—"One" and "Catholic"—are alive and operating today as ever. They may well note, furthermore, that it is not of the spirit of Christ's Church nor of His divine charity that migrants be accorded merely a courteous toleration, or, at best, a somewhat sterile feeling of pity or sympathy. Let it not be concluded, however, that this insistence on what is due to immigrants implies that there is nothing to be required of them. Far from it. Here there is question of mutual rights and mutual obligations. In its completeness the process of immigration is a mutual acceptance of duties and obligations from which flow a mutual enrichment.

Moreover, if the spirit of Christian charity permeates all, there shall be present qualities of graciousness and warmth that will reveal themselves to the immigrant as of heavenly origin, bringing to him, in his abnormal condition, immeasurable consolation, encouragement and inspiration.

Today then, Immigration Sunday, it is proposed that you would seek to know well and to fulfil your duties to those who come to share with you the task of developing and strengthening your homeland. With these newcomers and many, many thousands of others who are dispossessed or who seek new homes, you are asked to unite your prayers as manifesting the unity of the world-wide Catholic family.

Be mindful, as you give heed to what is sought of you, of the words of the Sacred Author: "For if a stranger comes to dwell in your land and to settle among you, do not treat him with disdain: welcome him as if he were native born and do him kindness as if he were one of yourselves" (*Leviticus* 19:33).

Pamphlets

CATHOLIC SOCIAL DOCTRINE AND THE LAYMAN

By ED MARCINIAK. What meaning does the Gospel have for a man's working life? How would Christ act were He a banker, a baker, a broker or a bartender? The social doctrine of the Church, writes Mr. Marciniak, is a vantage point from which the layman can regard his vocation in life. 15¢

Additional Readings

THE CATHOLIC AND HIS TRADE UNION
by George Lucy, S.J. 15¢

THE MYSTICAL BODY OF CHRIST
Encyclical of Pope Pius XII 25¢

CHRISTIAN MARRIAGE
Encyclical of Pope Pius XI 25¢

CHRISTIAN EDUCATION OF YOUTH
Encyclical of Pope Pius XI 25¢

THE SACRED HEART
Encyclical of Pope Pius XII 25¢

Special Offer

All 6 America Pamphlets
on Catholic
Social Doctrine

\$1

Send your prepaid orders to:

AMERICA PRESS, DEPT. CM
70 East 45th Street, New York 17, N.Y.

